

Comparison-Based Algorithms for One-Dimensional Stochastic Convex Optimization

Xi Chen

Stern School of Business, New York University, New York City, NY 10012, xchen3@stern.nyu.edu

Qihang Lin

Tippie College of Business, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA, 52245, qihang-lin@uiowa.edu

Zizhuo Wang

Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55455,
Institute of Data and Decision Analytics, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen, zwang@umn.edu

Stochastic optimization finds a wide range of applications in operations research and management science. However, existing stochastic optimization techniques usually require the information of random samples (e.g., demands in the newsvendor problem) or the objective values at the sampled points (e.g., the lost sales cost), which might not be available in practice. In this paper, we consider a new setup for stochastic optimization, in which the decision maker has access to only comparative information between a random sample and two chosen decision points in each iteration. We propose a comparison-based algorithm (CBA) to solve such problems in one dimension with convex objective functions. Particularly, the CBA properly chooses the two points in each iteration and constructs an unbiased gradient estimate for the original problem. We show that the CBA achieves the same convergence rate as the optimal stochastic gradient methods (with the samples observed). We also consider extensions of our approach to multi-dimensional quadratic problems as well as problems with non-convex objective functions. Numerical experiments show that the CBA performs well in test problems.

Key words: stochastic optimization, comparison, stochastic gradient

History: This version on April 18, 2019

1. Introduction

In this paper, we consider the following stochastic optimization problem:

$$\min_{\ell \leq x \leq u} H(x) = \mathbb{E}_{\xi} [h(x, \xi)] \quad (1)$$

where $-\infty \leq \ell \leq u \leq +\infty$ and ξ is a random variable.¹ This problem has many applications and is fundamental for stochastic optimization. For example,

1. If $h(x, \xi) = (x - \xi)^2$ with $\ell = -\infty$ and $u = +\infty$, then the problem is to find the expectation of ξ .

¹ Throughout the note, when $\ell = -\infty$ ($u = +\infty$, resp.), the notation $\ell \leq x$ ($x \leq u$, resp.) will be interpreted as $x > -\infty$ ($x < +\infty$, resp.).

2. If $h(x, \xi) = \mathfrak{h} \cdot (x - \xi)^+ + \mathfrak{b} \cdot (\xi - x)^+$, then the problem is the classical newsvendor problem with unit holding cost \mathfrak{h} and unit backorder cost \mathfrak{b} . It can also be viewed as the problem of finding the $\mathfrak{b}/(\mathfrak{h} + \mathfrak{b})$ -th quantile of ξ when $\ell = -\infty$ and $u = +\infty$. Furthermore, one can consider a more general version of this problem in which

$$h(x, \xi) = \begin{cases} \mathfrak{h}_+(x, \xi) & \text{if } x \geq \xi \\ \mathfrak{h}_-(x, \xi) & \text{if } x < \xi. \end{cases}$$

This problem can be viewed as a newsvendor problem with general holding and backorder costs (see, e.g., Halman et al. 2012 and references therein for discussions of this problem, where $\mathfrak{h}_+(x, \xi)$ is a general holding cost function and $\mathfrak{h}_-(x, \xi)$ is a general backorder cost function). It can also be viewed as a single period appointment scheduling problem with general waiting and overtime costs (see, e.g., Gupta and Denton 2008) or a staffing problem with general underage and overage costs (see, e.g., Kolker 2017).

3. If $h(x, \xi) = -x \cdot 1(\xi \geq x)$, then the problem can be viewed as an optimal pricing problem where x is the price set by the seller, ξ is the valuation of each customer, and $h(x, \xi)$ is the negative of the revenue obtained from the customer (a customer purchases at price x if and only if his/her valuation ξ is greater than or equal to x).

In many practical situations, the distribution of ξ (whose c.d.f. will be denoted by $F(\cdot)$) is unknown a priori. Existing stochastic optimization techniques for (1) usually require sampling from the distribution of ξ and use random samples to update the decision x toward optimality. In the existing methods, it is assumed that either the random samples of ξ are fully observed or the objective value $h(x, \xi)$ under a decision x and random samples ξ can be observed. However, such information may not always be available in practice (see Examples 1-3 below).

In this paper, we investigate whether having full sample information is always critical for solving one-dimensional stochastic convex optimization problems. We realize that, in some cases where full samples are not observed, comparative relation between a chosen decision variable and a random sample may still be accessible. This motivates us to study stochastic optimization with only the presence of comparative information. Specifically, given a decision x , a sample ξ is drawn from the underlying distribution, and we assume that we only have information about whether ξ is greater than or less than (or equals to) x . In addition, after knowing the comparative relation between x and ξ , we further assume that we can choose another point z and obtain information about whether ξ is greater than or less than (or equals to) z . Such a z is not as a decision variable but a randomly sampled point. We show that, in fact, having the comparative information in this way

can sometimes be sufficient for solving (1). In the following, we list several scenarios in which such situations may arise:

EXAMPLE 1. Suppose x represents a certain feature of a product (e.g., size or taste, etc) and ξ is the preference of each customer about that feature, and the firm selling this product would like to find out the average preference of the customers (or equivalently, to find the optimal offering to minimize the expected customer dissatisfaction, measured by $h(x, \xi) = (x - \xi)^2$). Such a firm faces a stochastic optimization problem described in the first example above. In many cases, it is hard for a customer to give an exact value for his/her preference (i.e., the exact value of his/her ξ). However, it is quite plausible that the customer can report comparative relation between his/her preferred value of the feature and the actual value of the feature of the product presented to him/her (e.g., whether the product should be larger or whether the taste should be saltier). Furthermore, it is possible to ask one customer to compare his/her preferred value with two different values of the same feature of the product, for example, by giving the customer two different samples. Moreover, the second sample may be given in a customer satisfaction survey, and the customer will not count the second sample toward its (dis)satisfaction value. Therefore, such a scenario fits the setting described above.

EXAMPLE 2. In a newsvendor problem, it is sometimes hard to observe the exact demand in each period due to demand censorship. In such situations, one does not have direct access to the sample point (the demand) nor does one have access to the cost in the corresponding period (the lost sales cost).² However, the seller usually has comparative information between the realized demand and the chosen inventory level (e.g., by observing if there is a stock out or a leftover). Moreover, by allowing the seller to make a one-time additional ordering in each time period (this ability is sometimes called the quick response ability for the seller, see e.g., Cachon and Swinney 2011), it is possible that one can obtain such information at two points. In such cases, the firm will face a newsvendor problem as described in the second example above, and thus it will correspond to the setting in our problem.

EXAMPLE 3. In a revenue management problem, by offering a price to each customer, the seller can observe whether the customer purchased the product, and the seller faces a stochastic optimization problem described in the third example above. In practice, it is hard to ask the customer to report a true valuation of the product. However, it is possible to ask the customer in a market survey whether he or she will purchase the product at a different price. Such an example can also be

² There is a vast literature on newsvendor/inventory problems with censored demand. For some recent references, we refer the readers to Ding et al. (2002), Bensoussan et al. (2007), and Besbes and Muharremoglu (2013).

extended to a divisible product case in which a customer can buy a continuous amount of a product with a maximum of 1. In this case, the h function can be redefined as $h(x, \xi) = -x \min\{1, g(x, \xi)\}$ where x is the offered price, $g(x, \xi)$ is the unconstrained purchase amount of the customer, and ξ is the maximum price this customer is willing to buy the full amount of this product (i.e., $g(x, \xi)$ is decreasing in x with $g(x, \xi) > 1$ when $x < \xi$ and $g(x, \xi) < 1$ when $x > \xi$). Such a purchase behavior can be explained by a quadratic utility function of the customer, which is often used in the literature (see e.g., Candogan et al. 2012). For the seller, by observing whether the customer buys the full amount of the product, he or she can infer whether an offered price is greater than or less than the ξ value of this customer.³

In this paper, we propose an efficient algorithm to solve the above-described stochastic optimization problem. More precisely, we propose a stochastic approximation algorithm that only utilizes comparative information between each sample point and two chosen decision points in each iteration. We show that by properly choosing the two points (one point has to be chosen randomly according to a specifically designed distribution), we can obtain unbiased gradient estimates for the original problem.⁴ The unbiased gradient estimates will in turn give rise to efficient algorithms based on a standard stochastic gradient method (we will review the related literature shortly). Under some mild conditions, we show that if the original problem is convex, then our algorithm will achieve a convergence rate of $O(1/\sqrt{T})$ for the objective value (where T is the number of iterations); if the original problem is strongly convex, then the convergence rate can be improved to $O(1/T)$. Moreover, the information at two points is necessary in this setting as we show that only knowing comparative information between the sample and one point in each iteration is insufficient for any algorithm to converge to the optimal solution (see Example 4). We also perform several numerical experiments using our algorithm. The experimental results show that our algorithms are indeed efficient, with convergence speed in the same order compared to the case when one has direct observations of the samples. We also extend our algorithm to a multi-dimensional setting with quadratic objective function, a setting with non-convex objective function and a setting in which multiple comparisons can be conducted in each iteration.

Literature Review. Broadly speaking, our work falls into the area of stochastic optimization, a subject on which there is vast literature. There has been a vast literature on stochastic optimization.

³ There is abundant recent literature that studies the setting in which the seller can observe the full information of ξ for each customer. In particular, it has been shown that in this case, the seller can obtain asymptotic optimal revenue as the selling horizon grows. For a review of this literature, we refer the readers to den Boer (2015).

⁴ If $h(x, \xi)$ is piecewise linear with two pieces, e.g., $h(x, \xi) = \mathfrak{h} \cdot (x - \xi)^+ + \mathfrak{b} \cdot (\xi - x)^+$, only comparing x and ξ may be sufficient to compute the stochastic gradient $h'_x(x, \xi)$ (that equals \mathfrak{h} or $-\mathfrak{b}$).

For a comprehensive review of this literature, we refer the readers to Shapiro et al. (2014). In particular, in this literature, it is usually assumed that one has access to random samples (or alternatively, the objective values at the sampled points). Two main types of algorithms have been proposed, namely the sample average approximation (SAA) method (see, e.g., Shapiro et al. 2014) and the stochastic approximation (SA) methods (see, e.g., Robbins and Monro 1951, Kiefer and Wolfowitz 1952). A typical SAA method collects a number of samples from the underlying distribution and uses the sample averaged objective function to approximate the expected value function. This method has been widely used in many operations management problems (see, e.g., Levi et al. 2015, Ban and Rudin 2018). In contrast, the SA approach (e.g., the stochastic gradient descent) is usually an iterative algorithm. In each iteration, a new sample (or a small batch of new samples) is drawn, and a new iterate is computed using the new sample(s). Our work belongs to the category of SA. In the following, we shall focus our literature review on the stochastic approximation methods.

If the objective function is convex, then various stochastic gradient methods can guarantee, under slightly different assumptions, that the objective value of the iterates converges to the optimal value in a rate of $O(1/\sqrt{T})$ after T iterations (see, e.g., Nemirovski et al. 2009, Duchi and Singer 2009, Hu et al. 2009, Xiao 2010, Lin et al. 2011, Chen et al. 2012, Lan 2012, Lan and Ghadimi 2012, Rakhlin et al. 2012, Lan and Ghadimi 2013, Shamir and Zhang 2013, Hazan and Kale 2014). Furthermore, this convergence rate is known to be optimal (Nemirovski and Yudin 1983). When the objective function is strongly convex, some stochastic gradient methods can obtain an improved convergence rate of $O(\log T/T)$ (Duchi and Singer 2009, Xiao 2010). More recently, several papers have further improved the convergence rate to $O(1/T)$. Among those papers, there are three different methods used: (a) accelerated stochastic gradient method with auxiliary iterates besides the main iterate (Hu et al. 2009, Lin et al. 2011, Lan 2012, Lan and Ghadimi 2012, Chen et al. 2012, Lan and Ghadimi 2013); (b) averaging the historical solutions (Rakhlin et al. 2012, Shamir and Zhang 2013); and (c) multi-stage stochastic gradient method that periodically restarts (Hazan and Kale 2014). Again, the convergence rate of $O(1/T)$ has been shown to be optimal by Nemirovski and Yudin (1983) for strongly convex problems.

Apart from the setting of minimizing a single objective function, stochastic gradient methods can also be applied to online learning problems (for a comprehensive review, see Shalev-Shwartz 2012) where a sequence of functions is presented to a decision maker who needs to provide a solution sequentially to each function with the goal of minimizing the total regret. It is known that the stochastic gradient methods can obtain a regret of $O(\sqrt{T})$ after T decisions if the functions presented are convex. Moreover, this regret has been shown to be optimal (Cesa-Bianchi and Lugosi

2006). When the functions are strongly convex, Zinkevich (2003), Duchi and Singer (2009), Xiao (2010) and Duchi et al. (2011) show that the regret can be further improved to $O(\log T)$.

To distinguish our work from the above, we note that all of the above works have assumed that either the sample is directly accessible (one can observe the value of each sample) or the objective value corresponding to the decision variable and the current sample is accessible. In either case, it is easy to obtain an estimate of the gradient of the objective function. In contrast, in our case, we do not have access to the sample or the objective value. Instead, we only have comparative information between each sample and two chosen decision points. Indeed as we shall discuss in the next section, one of the main challenges in our problem is to use this very limited information to construct an unbiased gradient for the original problem and then further use it to find the optimal solution. Our contribution is to show that the same order of convergence rate can still be achieved under this setting with less information.

2. Main Results

In this paper, we make the following assumptions:

ASSUMPTION 1.

(A1) *The random variable ξ follows a continuous distribution.*

(A2) *For each ξ , $h(x, \xi)$ is continuously differentiable with respect to x on $[\ell, \xi)$ and $(\xi, u]$ with the derivative denoted by $h'_x(x, \xi)$. Furthermore, for any $x \in [\ell, u]$, $h'_-(x) := \lim_{z \rightarrow x-} h'_x(x, z)$ and $h'_+(x) := \lim_{z \rightarrow x+} h'_x(x, z)$ exist and are finite.*

(A3) *For any $x \in [\ell, u]$, $x \neq \xi$, $h''_{x,\xi}(x, \xi) = \frac{\partial^2 h(x, \xi)}{\partial \xi \partial x}$ exists.*

(A4) *$H(x)$ in (1) is differentiable and μ -convex on $[\ell, u]$ for some $\mu \geq 0$, namely,*

$$H(x_2) \geq H(x_1) + H'(x_1)(x_2 - x_1) + \frac{\mu}{2}(x_2 - x_1)^2, \quad \forall x_1, x_2 \in [\ell, u]. \quad (2)$$

Moreover, $\mathbb{E}_\xi(h'_x(x, \xi)) = H'(x)$ for all $x \in [\ell, u]$.

(A5) *Either of the following statements is true:*

- a. *There exists a constant K_1 such that $\mathbb{E}_\xi(h'_x(x, \xi))^2 \leq K_1^2$ for any $x \in [\ell, u]$;*
- b. *$H'(x)$ is L -Lipschitz continuous on $[\ell, u]$. Furthermore, there exists a constant K_2 such that*

$$\mathbb{E}_\xi(h'_x(x, \xi) - H'(x))^2 \leq K_2^2, \quad \forall x \in [\ell, u].$$

Now we make several comments on the above assumptions. The first assumption that ξ is continuously distributed is mainly for the ease of discussion. In fact, all of our results will continue to hold as long as with probability 1, for all iterates x in our algorithm, $\mathbb{P}(\xi = x) = 0$. We shall

revisit this assumption in Section 6. Assumptions A2-A4 are some regularity assumptions on the functions h and H . Particularly, the last point of Assumption A4 is satisfied under many cases, for example, when $h'_x(x, \xi)$ is continuous in ξ and ξ is supported on a finite set (Widder 1990), or when $h(x, \xi)$ is convex in x for each ξ (by monotone convergence theorem). When (2) holds with $\mu > 0$, we call H a μ -strongly convex function. The last assumption states that the partial derivative $h'_x(x, \xi)$ has uniformly bounded second-order moment or variance. This is used to guarantee that the step in each iteration in our algorithm has bounded variance, which is a common assumption in stochastic approximation literature (see, e.g., Nemirovski et al. 2009, Duchi and Singer 2009, Lan and Ghadimi 2013).

In addition, Assumption 1 is not hard to satisfy in our examples mentioned earlier. Specifically, for Example 1, it satisfies Assumption 1 when ξ is continuously distributed and has finite variance. For Example 2, it satisfies Assumption 1 when ξ is continuously distributed and the cost functions are linear. When the cost functions are nonlinear (\mathfrak{h}_+ and \mathfrak{h}_- respectively), it satisfies Assumption 1 if both \mathfrak{h}_+ and \mathfrak{h}_- are second-order continuously differentiable on their respective domains, have bounded first-order derivatives (for example, when x and ξ are restricted to finite intervals), and h is convex in x . For Example 3, it satisfies Assumption 1 under the divisible case when ξ is a continuous random variable and the expected revenue function $x\mathbb{E}_\xi \min\{g(x, \xi), 1\}$ is concave on $[\ell, u]$, which holds, for example, when $g(x, \xi)$ is a piecewise linear function and when the range $[\ell, u]$ is small.⁵

In the following, we propose a comparison-based algorithm (CBA) to solve (1). Let Ξ denote the support of ξ with $-\infty \leq \underline{x} := \inf\{\Xi\} \leq \bar{x} := \sup\{\Xi\} \leq +\infty$. The algorithm requires specification of two functions, $f_-(x, z)$ and $f_+(x, z)$, which need to satisfy the following conditions.

- (C1) $f_-(x, z) = 0$ for all $z \geq x$ and $f_-(x, z) > 0$ for all $\underline{x} \leq z < x$. In addition, for all x , we have $\int_{-\infty}^{x-} f_-(x, z) dz = 1$.
- (C2) $f_+(x, z) = 0$ for all $z \leq x$ and $f_+(x, z) > 0$ for all $\bar{x} \geq z > x$. In addition, for all x , we have $\int_{x+}^{\infty} f_+(x, z) dz = 1$.
- (C3) There exists a constant K_3 such that $\int_{\underline{x}}^{x-} \frac{F(z)(h''_{x,z}(x, z))^2}{f_-(x, z)} dz \leq K_3$ and $\int_{x+}^{\bar{x}} \frac{(1-F(z))(h''_{x,z}(x, z))^2}{f_+(x, z)} dz \leq K_3$ for all $x \in [\ell, u]$, where $F(\cdot)$ is the c.d.f. of ξ .

Note that, for any given $x \in [\ell, u]$, $f_-(x, z)$ and $f_+(x, z)$ essentially define two density functions of z on $(-\infty, x]$ and $[x, +\infty)$. (We will discuss how to choose $f_-(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $f_+(\cdot, \cdot)$ in Section 3.) Also, we

⁵ The indivisible product case with $h(x, \xi) = -x \cdot 1(\xi \geq x)$ does not satisfy Assumption (A4). In particular, it does not satisfy $\mathbb{E}_\xi(h'_x(x, \xi)) = H'(x)$ (it does satisfy all the other assumptions under mild conditions though). In order to satisfy $\mathbb{E}_\xi(h'_x(x, \xi)) = H'(x)$, it is sufficient that $h(x, \xi)$ is continuous in x , which holds in the divisible product case.

note that \underline{s} and \bar{s} need not to be known in advance. If one is unsure about \underline{s} (\bar{s} , resp.), then one can choose a sufficiently small (large, resp.) value, or just choose $\underline{s} = -\infty$ ($\bar{s} = +\infty$, resp.). Condition (C3) is a technical condition and may not be straightforward to verify at the first glance. However, in Section 3, we show that under mild conditions (e.g., ξ has a light tail and $h''_{x,z}(x, z)$ is uniformly bounded), it is not hard to choose the functions $f_-(x, z)$ and $f_+(x, z)$ such that condition (C3) is satisfied (we will leave the detailed discussions in Section 3). Next, in Algorithm 1, we describe the detailed procedure of the CBA.

Algorithm 1 Comparison-Based Algorithm (CBA):

1. **Initialization.** Set $t = 1$, $x_1 \in [\ell, u]$. Define η_t for all $t \geq 1$. Set the maximum number of iterations T . Choose functions $f_-(x, z)$ and $f_+(x, z)$ that satisfy (C1)-(C3).
2. **Main iteration.** Sample ξ_t from the distribution of ξ . If $\xi_t = x_t$, then resample ξ_t until it does not equal x_t . (This step will always terminate in a finite number of steps as long as ξ is not deterministic.)
 - (a) If $\xi_t < x_t$, then generate z_t from a distribution on $(-\infty, x_t]$ with p.d.f. $f_-(x_t, z_t)$. Set

$$g(x_t, \xi_t, z_t) = \begin{cases} h'_-(x_t), & \text{if } z_t < \xi_t, \\ h'_-(x_t) - \frac{h''_{x,z}(x_t, z_t)}{f_-(x_t, z_t)}, & \text{if } z_t \geq \xi_t. \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

- (b) If $\xi_t > x_t$, then generate z_t from a distribution on $[x_t, +\infty)$ with p.d.f. $f_+(x_t, z_t)$. Set

$$g(x_t, \xi_t, z_t) = \begin{cases} h'_+(x_t), & \text{if } z_t > \xi_t, \\ h'_+(x_t) + \frac{h''_{x,z}(x_t, z_t)}{f_+(x_t, z_t)}, & \text{if } z_t \leq \xi_t. \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Let

$$x_{t+1} = \text{Proj}_{[\ell, u]}(x_t - \eta_t g(x_t, \xi_t, z_t)) = \max(\ell, \min(u, x_t - \eta_t g(x_t, \xi_t, z_t))). \quad (5)$$

3. **Termination.** Stop when $t \geq T$. Otherwise, let $t \leftarrow t + 1$ and go back to Step 2.
 4. **Output.** $\text{CBA}(x_1, T, \{\eta_t\}_{t=1}^T) = \bar{x}_T = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T x_t$.
-

In iteration t of CBA, the solution x_t will be updated based on two random samples. First, a sample ξ_t is drawn from the distribution of ξ . In contrast to existing stochastic gradient methods, CBA does not require exactly observing ξ_t but only needs to know whether $\xi_t < x_t$ or $\xi_t > x_t$. Based on the result of the comparison between ξ_t and x_t , a second sample z_t is drawn from the density function $f_+(x_t, z)$ or $f_-(x_t, z)$. An unbiased stochastic gradient, $g(x_t, \xi_t, z_t)$, of $H(x_t)$ is then constructed and used to update x_t with the standard gradient descent step.

We note that the output of Algorithm 1 is the average of the historical solutions $\bar{x}_T = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T x_t$. This is because the convergence of objective value is established based on \bar{x}_T . However, Algorithm 1 can be applied to the online learning setting where one can use the solution x_t as the decision in each stage t and obtain the desired expected total regret (see Proposition 2-4). We have the following proposition about the stochastic gradient $g(x_t, \xi_t, z_t)$ in CBA.

PROPOSITION 1. *Suppose $f_-(x, z)$ and $f_+(x, z)$ satisfy (C1)-(C3) and Assumption 1 holds. Then*

1. $\mathbb{E}_z g(x, \xi, z) = h'_x(x, \xi)$, for all $x \in [\ell, u]$, $x \neq \xi$.
2. $\mathbb{E}_{z, \xi} g(x, \xi, z) = H'(x)$, for all $x \in [\ell, u]$.
3. *If Assumption A5(a) holds, then $\mathbb{E}_{z, \xi} (g(x, \xi, z))^2 \leq G^2 := K_1^2 + 2K_3$. If Assumption A5(b) holds, then $\mathbb{E}_{z, \xi} (g(x, \xi, z) - H'(x))^2 \leq \sigma^2 := K_2^2 + 2K_3$.*

Proof of Proposition 1. First, we consider the case when $\xi < x$. We have

$$\mathbb{E}_z g(x, \xi, z) = h'_-(x) - \int_{\xi}^{x-} h''_{x,z}(x, z) dz = h'_x(x, \xi).$$

Similarly, when $\xi > x$,

$$\mathbb{E}_z g(x, \xi, z) = h'_+(x) + \int_{x+}^{\xi} h''_{x,z}(x, z) dz = h'_x(x, \xi).$$

Thus the first conclusion of the proposition is proved. The second conclusion of the proposition follows from Assumption A1 (which ensures $\xi = x$ is a zero-measure event) and Assumption A4.

Next, we show the first part of the third conclusion when Assumption A5(a) is true. If $\xi < x$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_z (g(x, \xi, z))^2 &= \int_{-\infty}^{x-} (h'_-(x))^2 f_-(x, z) dz + \int_{\xi}^{x-} \left(-2h'_-(x) \frac{h''_{x,z}(x, z)}{f_-(x, z)} + \left(\frac{h''_{x,z}(x, z)}{f_-(x, z)} \right)^2 \right) f_-(x, z) dz \\ &= (h'_-(x))^2 - 2h'_-(x)(h'_-(x) - h'_x(x, \xi)) + \int_{\xi}^{x-} \frac{(h''_{x,z}(x, z))^2}{f_-(x, z)} dz \\ &\leq (h'_x(x, \xi))^2 + \int_{\xi}^{x-} \frac{(h''_{x,z}(x, z))^2}{f_-(x, z)} dz. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where the last inequality is because $a^2 + b^2 \geq 2ab$ for any a, b . By similar arguments, if $\xi > x$, then

$$\mathbb{E}_z (g(x, \xi, z))^2 \leq (h'_x(x, \xi))^2 + \int_{x+}^{\xi} \frac{(h''_{x,z}(x, z))^2}{f_+(x, z)} dz.$$

These two inequalities and Assumption A5(a) further imply

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{z, \xi} (g(x, \xi, z))^2 &\leq K_1^2 + \int_{\underline{s}}^{x-} \left(\int_{\xi}^{x-} \frac{(h''_{x,z}(x, z))^2}{f_-(x, z)} dz \right) dF(\xi) + \int_{x+}^{\bar{s}} \left(\int_{x+}^{\xi} \frac{(h''_{x,z}(x, z))^2}{f_+(x, z)} dz \right) dF(\xi) \\ &= K_1^2 + \int_{\underline{s}}^{x-} \frac{F(z)(h''_{x,z}(x, z))^2}{f_-(x, z)} dz + \int_{x+}^{\bar{s}} \frac{(1 - F(z))(h''_{x,z}(x, z))^2}{f_+(x, z)} dz \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

$$\leq K_1^2 + 2K_3,$$

where the interchanging of integrals in the equality is justified by Tonelli's theorem and the last inequality is due to (C3).

Next, we show the second part of the third conclusion when Assumption A5(b) is true. If $\xi < x$, then following the similar analysis as in (6), we have

$$\mathbb{E}_z(g(x, \xi, z) - h'_x(x, \xi))^2 = \mathbb{E}_z(g(x, \xi, z))^2 - (h'_x(x, \xi))^2 \leq \int_{\xi}^{x-} \frac{(h''_{x,z}(x, z))^2}{f_-(x, z)} dz.$$

Similarly, if $\xi > x$, then

$$\mathbb{E}_z(g(x, \xi, z) - h'_x(x, \xi))^2 \leq \int_{x+}^{\xi} \frac{(h''_{x,z}(x, z))^2}{f_+(x, z)} dz.$$

By using the same argument as in (7), we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{z,\xi}(g(x, \xi, z) - h'_x(x, \xi))^2 \leq 2K_3.$$

Finally, we note that,

$$\mathbb{E}_{z,\xi}(g(x, \xi, z) - H'(x))^2 = \mathbb{E}_{z,\xi}(g(x, \xi, z) - h'_x(x, \xi))^2 + \mathbb{E}_{\xi}(h'_x(x, \xi) - H'(x))^2.$$

Therefore, when Assumption A5(b) holds, we have $\mathbb{E}_{z,\xi}(g(x, \xi, z) - H'(x))^2 \leq K_2^2 + 2K_3$. Thus the proposition holds. \square

Proposition 1 shows that in the CBA, the gradient estimate $g(x, \xi, z)$ is an unbiased estimate of the true gradient at x and can be utilized as a stochastic gradient of $H(x)$. Note that such an unbiased gradient is generated without accessing the sample ξ itself nor the value of the objective function $h(x, \xi)$ at the sampled point. The only information used in generating the unbiased gradient is comparative information between the sample and two points.

Using the unbiased stochastic gradient, we can characterize the convergence results of the CBA in the following propositions.

PROPOSITION 2. *Suppose $\mu = 0$. Let G^2 and σ^2 be defined as in Proposition 1 and x^* be any optimal solution to (1).*

- *If Assumption A5(a) holds, then by choosing $\eta_t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}$, the CBA ensures that*

$$\mathbb{E}(H(\bar{x}_T) - H(x^*)) \leq \frac{(x_1 - x^*)^2}{2\sqrt{T}} + \frac{G^2}{2\sqrt{T}} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}(H(x_t) - H(x^*)) \leq \frac{\sqrt{T}}{2}(x_1 - x^*)^2 + \frac{\sqrt{T}G^2}{2}.$$

If, in addition, u and ℓ are finite, then by choosing $\eta_t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}$, the CBA ensures that

$$\mathbb{E}(H(\bar{x}_T) - H(x^*)) \leq \frac{(u - \ell)^2}{2\sqrt{T}} + \frac{G^2}{\sqrt{T}} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}(H(x_t) - H(x^*)) \leq \frac{\sqrt{T}}{2}(u - \ell)^2 + \sqrt{T}G^2.$$

- If Assumption A5(b) holds, then by choosing $\eta_t = \frac{1}{L+\sqrt{T}}$, the CBA ensures that

$$\mathbb{E}(H(\bar{x}_T) - H(x^*)) \leq \frac{L + \sqrt{T}}{2T}(x_1 - x^*)^2 + \frac{H(x_1) - H(x^*)}{T} + \frac{\sigma^2}{2\sqrt{T}}, \text{ and}$$

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}(H(x_t) - H(x^*)) \leq \frac{L + \sqrt{T}}{2}(x_1 - x^*)^2 + H(x_1) - H(x^*) + \frac{\sqrt{T}\sigma^2}{2}.$$

If, in addition, u and ℓ are finite, then by choosing $\eta_t = \frac{1}{L+\sqrt{t}}$, the CBA ensures that

$$\mathbb{E}(H(\bar{x}_T) - H(x^*)) \leq \frac{(u - \ell)^2}{2\sqrt{T}} + \frac{H(x_1) - H(x^*)}{T} + \frac{L(x_1 - x^*)^2}{2T} + \frac{\sigma^2}{\sqrt{T}}, \text{ and}$$

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}(H(x_t) - H(x^*)) \leq \frac{\sqrt{T}}{2}(u - \ell)^2 + H(x_1) - H(x^*) + \frac{L}{2}(x_1 - x^*)^2 + \sqrt{T}\sigma^2.$$

Proposition 2 gives the performance of the CBA when $\mu = 0$. When $\mu = 0$ and u and/or ℓ are infinite, the stepsize η_t is chosen to be a constant depending on the total number of iterations T in order to achieve the optimal convergence rate (i.e., $\eta_t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}$ when Assumption A5(a) holds and $\eta_t = \frac{1}{L+\sqrt{T}}$ when Assumption A5(b) holds). Therefore, one needs to determine the total number of iterations T before running the optimization algorithm for the computation of the stepsize. When $\mu = 0$ and u and ℓ are finite, the stepsize η_t can be chosen as a decreasing sequence in t (i.e., $\eta_t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}$ when Assumption A5(a) holds and $\eta_t = \frac{1}{L+\sqrt{t}}$ when Assumption A5(b) holds). In such a case, one does not need to pre-specify the total number of iterations T . The convergence result when Assumption A5(a) holds has a proof similar to Nemirovski et al. (2009) and Duchi and Singer (2009) except using our comparison-based stochastic gradient. Also, the convergence result when Assumption A5(b) holds is largely built upon the results in Lan (2012). The detailed proof of the proposition are given in Appendix A.

Next, we have a further result when $\mu > 0$.

PROPOSITION 3. Suppose $\mu > 0$. Let G^2 and σ^2 be defined as in Proposition 1 and x^* be any optimal solution to (1).

- If Assumption A5(a) holds, then by choosing $\eta_t = \frac{1}{\mu t}$, the CBA ensures that

$$\mathbb{E}(H(\bar{x}_T) - H(x^*)) \leq \frac{G^2 \log T + 1}{2\mu T} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}(H(x_t) - H(x^*)) \leq \frac{G^2}{2\mu}(\log T + 1).$$

- If Assumption A5(b) holds, then by choosing $\eta_t = \frac{1}{\mu t + L}$, the CBA ensures that

$$\mathbb{E}(H(\bar{x}_T) - H(x^*)) \leq \frac{\sigma^2 \log T + 1}{2\mu T} + \frac{H(x_1) - H(x^*)}{T} + \frac{L(x_1 - x^*)^2}{2T}, \text{ and}$$

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}(H(x_t) - H(x^*)) \leq \frac{\sigma^2}{2\mu}(\log T + 1) + H(x_1) - H(x^*) + \frac{L(x_1 - x^*)^2}{2}.$$

Proposition 3 gives the performance of the CBA when $\mu > 0$. The convergence rate of $O(\log T/T)$ when $\mu > 0$ is better than the convergence rate of $O(1/\sqrt{T})$ when $\mu = 0$. In such case, one does not need to know T in advance and can always choose the stepsize as a decreasing sequence in t . Again, the detailed proof of the proposition is given in Appendix A.

According to Proposition 3, when $\mu > 0$, the convergence rate of CBA is $O(\log T/T)$. In the following, we improve the convergence rate when $\mu > 0$ to $O(1/T)$ using a restarting method first proposed by Hazan and Kale (2014). In Hazan and Kale (2014), the authors show that the restarting method works when Assumption A5(a) holds. In this paper, we extend the result by showing that the restarting method can also obtain the $O(1/T)$ rate if Assumption A5(b) holds. According to Nemirovski and Yudin (1983), no algorithm can achieve convergence rate better than $O(1/T)$, thus we have obtained the best possible convergence rates in those settings. We now describe the restarting method in Algorithm 2, which we will later refer to as the multi-stage comparison-based algorithm (MCBA).

Algorithm 2 Multi-stage Comparison-Based Algorithm (MCBA)

1. Initialize the number of stages $K \geq 1$, the starting solution \hat{x}^1 . Set $k = 1$.
 2. Let T_k be the number of iterations in stage k and η_t^k be the step length in iteration t of CBA in stage k for $t = 1, 2, \dots, T_k$.
 3. Let $\hat{x}^{k+1} = \mathbf{CBA}(\hat{x}^k, T_k, \{\eta_t^k\}_{t=1}^{T_k})$.
 4. Stop when $k \geq K$. Otherwise, let $k \leftarrow k + 1$ and go back to step 2.
 5. Output \hat{x}^{K+1} .
-

We have the following proposition about the performance of Algorithm 2. The proof of the proposition is given in Appendix A.

PROPOSITION 4. *Suppose $\mu > 0$. Let G^2 and σ^2 be defined as in Proposition 1, x^* be any optimal solution to (1), and $T = \sum_{k=1}^K T_k$ with T_k defined in MCBA.*

• *If Assumption A5(a) holds, then by choosing $\eta_t^k = \frac{1}{2^{k+1}\mu}$ and $T_k = 2^{k+3}$, the MCBA ensures that*

$$\mathbb{E}(H(\hat{x}_{K+1}) - H(x^*)) \leq \frac{16(H(\hat{x}_1) - H(x^*) + G^2/\mu)}{T}.$$

• *If Assumption A5(b) holds, then by choosing $\eta_t^k = \frac{1}{2^{k+1}\mu+L}$ and $T_k = 2^{k+3} + 4$, the MCBA ensures that*

$$\mathbb{E}(H(\hat{x}_{K+1}) - H(x^*)) \leq \frac{32(H(\hat{x}_1) - H(x^*) + L(\hat{x}_1 - x^*)^2/2 + \sigma^2/\mu)}{T}.$$

Both Proposition 3 and 4 give the convergence rates of CBA and MCBA for strongly convex problems (i.e., $\mu > 0$). The convergence rate of MCBA is $O(1/T)$ which improves the $O(\log T/T)$ convergence rate of CBA by a factor of $\log T$. The intuition for this difference is that the output \bar{x}_T of CBA is the average of all historical solutions so its quality is reduced by the earlier solutions (i.e., x_t with a small t) which are far from the optimal solution. On the contrary, MCBA restarts CBA periodically with a better initial solution (i.e., \hat{x}_k) for each restart. As a result, the output of MCBA is the average of historical solutions only in the last (K th) call of CBA which does not involve the earlier solutions and thus has a higher quality. This is the main reason for MCBA to have a better solution after the same number of iterations, or equivalently, a better convergence rate than CBA. However, CBA is easier to implement as it does not require periodic restart as needed in MCBA. Moreover, the theoretical convergence of MCBA requires strong convexity in the problem while CBA converges without strong convexity requirement (see Proposition 2).⁶

By Proposition 2-4, we have shown that under some mild assumptions (Assumption 1), if one has access to comparative information between each sample ξ_t and *two* points, then one can still find the optimal solution to (1), and the convergence speed is in the same order as when one can observe the actual value of the sample (or the objective value at the sampled point). One natural question is whether the same convergence result can be achieved by only having comparative information between each sample ξ_t and *one* point. The next example gives a negative answer to this question, showing that it is impossible to always find the optimal solution in this case, even if one allows the algorithm to be a randomized one. Thus it verifies the necessity of having comparative information at two points in each iteration (for each sample).

EXAMPLE 4. Let $h(x, \xi) = (x - \xi)^2$, $\ell = -1$ and $u = 1$. In this case, the optimization problem (1) is to find the projection of the expected value of ξ onto the interval $[-1, 1]$. Suppose there are two underlying distributions for ξ . In the first case, ξ follows a uniform distribution on $[-3, -2]$ or $[2, 3]$, each with probability 0.5. In the second case, ξ follows a uniform distribution on $[-3, -2]$ or $[3, 4]$, each with probability 0.5. In the following, we denote the distributions corresponding to the first and second cases by $F_1(\cdot)$ and $F_2(\cdot)$, respectively. It is easy to verify that in the first case, the optimal solution to (1) is $x^* = 0$, while in the second case, the optimal solution to (1) is $x^* = 0.25$. And it is also easy to verify that the above settings (both cases) satisfy Assumption 1.

Now we consider any algorithm that only utilizes the comparative information between ξ_t and one decision point x_t in each iteration (however, the point has to be chosen between $[\ell, u]$ since we

⁶ Note that, in Proposition 4, we only focus on the case when $\mu > 0$ since MCBA is mainly designed to improve the convergence rate $O(\log T/T)$ of CBA when the problem is strongly convex. When $\mu = 0$, the convergence rate of MCBA is still $O(1/\sqrt{T})$.

can modify $h(x, \xi)$ such that it is undefined or ∞ on $x \notin [\ell, u]$. Suppose the algorithm maps x_t and the comparative information between ξ_t and the chosen decision point to a distribution of x_{t+1} (thus we allow randomized algorithm). Note that for any $x \in [\ell, u]$, $F_1(x) = F_2(x) = 0.5$. In other words, there is a 0.5 probability that $\xi > x$ and a 0.5 probability that $\xi < x$ no matter whether ξ is drawn from $F_1(\cdot)$ or $F_2(\cdot)$. For any algorithm, the distribution of each x_t will be the same under either case. Thus, no algorithm can return the optimal solution in both cases. In other words, no algorithm can guarantee to solve (1) with comparative information between each sample and only one point, even under Assumption 1. \square

3. Choice of f_- and f_+

In the CBA, one important step is the specification of the two sets of density functions $f_-(x, z)$ and $f_+(x, z)$. In the last section, we only said that f_- and f_+ need to satisfy conditions (C1)-(C3) but did not give any specific examples. Nor did we discuss what are good choices of f_- and f_+ . In this section, we address this issue by first showing several examples of f_- and f_+ which could be useful in practice and then discussing the effect of choices of f_- and f_+ on the efficiency of the algorithms. We start with the following examples of choices of f_- and f_+ .

EXAMPLE 5 (UNIFORM SAMPLING DISTRIBUTION). Suppose the support of ξ is known to be contained in a finite interval $[\underline{s}, \bar{s}]$ and the optimal decision x^* is known to be within a finite interval $[\ell, u]$. (Without loss of generality, we assume $[\underline{s}, \bar{s}] \subseteq [\ell, u]$. Otherwise, we can expand $[\ell, u]$ to contain $[\underline{s}, \bar{s}]$.) And we assume $h''_{x,z}(x, z)$ is uniformly bounded on $[\ell, u] \times [\underline{s}, \bar{s}]$, $x \neq z$. Then we can set both $f_-(x, z)$ and $f_+(x, z)$ to be uniformly distributed, i.e., for $x \in (\ell, u)$,

$$f_-(x, z) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{x-\ell} & \ell \leq z < x \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad f_+(x, z) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{u-x} & x < z \leq u \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

When $x = \ell$, we can set f_- to be a uniform distribution on $[\ell - 1, \ell]$; and when $x = u$, we can set f_+ to be a uniform distribution on $[u, u + 1]$. It is not hard to verify that this set of choices satisfy conditions (C1)-(C3).

EXAMPLE 6 (EXPONENTIAL SAMPLING DISTRIBUTION). Suppose the support of ξ is \mathbb{R} or unknown, and ξ follows a light tail distribution (more precisely, there exists a constant $\bar{\lambda} > 0$ such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{\bar{\lambda}t} \mathbb{P}(|\xi| > t) = 0$). Moreover, x is constrained on a finite interval $[\ell, u]$ and we assume $h''_{x,z}(x, z)$ is uniformly bounded on $[\ell, u] \times \mathbb{R}$, $x \neq z$. Then we can choose f_- and f_+ to be exponential distributions. More precisely, we can choose

$$f_-(x, z) = \begin{cases} 0 & z \geq x \\ \lambda_- \exp(-\lambda_-(x - z)) & z < x \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad f_+(x, z) = \begin{cases} \lambda_+ \exp(-\lambda_+(z - x)) & z > x \\ 0 & z \leq x \end{cases}$$

where $0 < \lambda_-, \lambda_+ < \bar{\lambda}$ are two parameters one can adjust. Apparently under this choice of f_- and f_+ , conditions (C1)-(C2) are satisfied. For (C3), we note that by the light tail assumption, there exists a constant C such that $e^{-\bar{\lambda}t}F(t) \leq C$ and $e^{\bar{\lambda}t}(1-F(t)) \leq C$ for all t . Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-\infty}^{x-} \frac{F(z)}{f_-(x,z)} dz &= \frac{e^{\lambda_- x}}{\lambda_-} \int_{-\infty}^x e^{-\lambda_- z} F(z) dz \leq \frac{Ce^{\lambda_- x}}{\lambda_-} \int_{-\infty}^x e^{(\bar{\lambda}-\lambda_-)z} dz \leq \frac{Ce^{\bar{\lambda}x}}{(\bar{\lambda}-\lambda_-)\lambda_-}, \\ \int_{x+}^{\infty} \frac{1-F(z)}{f_+(x,z)} dz &= \frac{e^{-\lambda_+ x}}{\lambda_+} \int_x^{\infty} e^{\lambda_+ z} (1-F(z)) dz \leq \frac{Ce^{-\lambda_+ x}}{\lambda_+} \int_x^{\infty} e^{-(\bar{\lambda}-\lambda_+)z} dz \leq \frac{Ce^{-\bar{\lambda}x}}{(\bar{\lambda}-\lambda_+)\lambda_+}. \end{aligned}$$

Combined with the uniform boundedness of $h''_{x,z}(x,z)$, condition (C3) also holds in this case.

Next we discuss the effect of choosing different f_- and f_+ on the efficiency of the algorithm and the optimal choices of f_- and f_+ . First we note that by Proposition 2-4, the choice of f_- and f_+ does not affect the asymptotic convergence rate of the algorithms as long as they satisfy conditions (C1)-(C3). All what they affect is the constant in the convergence results, which depends on $\mathbb{E}_{z,\xi}(g(x,\xi,z))^2$ or $\mathbb{E}_{z,\xi}(g(x,\xi,z) - H'(x))^2$ (depending on whether Assumption A5(a) or A5(b) holds). However, by Proposition 1, $\mathbb{E}_{z,\xi}(g(x,\xi,z) - H'(x))^2 = \mathbb{E}_{z,\xi}(g(x,\xi,z))^2 - (H'(x))^2$, i.e., the two terms only differ by a constant which does not depend on the choice of f_- and f_+ . Therefore, in what follows, we focus on choosing f_- and f_+ to minimize $\mathbb{E}_{z,\xi}(g(x,\xi,z))^2$.

By (6), for any $\xi < x$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_z(g(x,\xi,z))^2 = 2h'_-(x)h'_x(x,\xi) - (h'_-(x))^2 + \int_{\xi}^{x-} \frac{(h''_{x,z}(x,z))^2}{f_-(x,z)} dz.$$

By a similar argument, for $\xi > x$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_z(g(x,\xi,z))^2 = 2h'_-(x)h'_x(x,\xi) - (h'_-(x))^2 + \int_{x+}^{\xi} \frac{(h''_{x,z}(x,z))^2}{f_+(x,z)} dz.$$

Further taking expectation over ξ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{z,\xi}(g(x,\xi,z))^2 \\ &= 2h'_-(x)H'(x) - (h'_-(x))^2 + \int_{-\infty}^{x-} \left(\int_{\xi}^{x-} \frac{(h''_{x,z}(x,z))^2}{f_-(x,z)} dz \right) dF(\xi) + \int_{x+}^{\infty} \left(\int_{x+}^{\xi} \frac{(h''_{x,z}(x,z))^2}{f_+(x,z)} dz \right) dF(\xi) \\ &= 2h'_-(x)H'(x) - (h'_-(x))^2 + \int_{-\infty}^{x-} \frac{F(z)(h''_{x,z}(x,z))^2}{f_-(x,z)} dz + \int_{x+}^{\infty} \frac{(1-F(z))(h''_{x,z}(x,z))^2}{f_+(x,z)} dz. \end{aligned}$$

By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and condition (C1), we have

$$\int_{-\infty}^{x-} \frac{F(z)(h''_{x,z}(x,z))^2}{f_-(x,z)} dz = \int_{-\infty}^{x-} \frac{F(z)(h''_{x,z}(x,z))^2}{f_-(x,z)} dz \cdot \int_{-\infty}^{x-} f_-(x,z) dz \geq \left(\int_{-\infty}^x \sqrt{F(z)} |h''_{x,z}(x,z)| dz \right)^2.$$

And the equality holds only if $f_-(x,z) = C_- \sqrt{F(z)} |h''_{x,z}(x,z)|$, for all $z < x$ for some $C_- > 0$.

Therefore, if $\sqrt{F(z)} |h''_{x,z}(x,z)|$ is integrable on $(-\infty, x]$, then the optimal choice for $f_-(x,z)$ is

$$f_-(x,z) = \frac{\sqrt{F(z)} |h''_{x,z}(x,z)|}{\int_{-\infty}^x \sqrt{F(z)} |h''_{x,z}(x,z)| dz}, \quad \forall z < x. \quad (8)$$

Similarly, if $\sqrt{1-F(z)}|h''_{x,z}(x,z)|$ is integrable on $[x, \infty)$, then the optimal choice for $f_+(x, z)$ is

$$f_+(x, z) = \frac{\sqrt{1-F(z)}|h''_{x,z}(x, z)|}{\int_x^\infty \sqrt{1-F(z)}|h''_{x,z}(x, z)|dz}, \quad \forall z > x. \quad (9)$$

Now we use an example to illustrate the above results. Suppose $h(x, \xi) = (x - \xi)^2$ and $F(z)$ is a uniform distribution on $[a, b]$. Then the optimal choice of f_- and f_+ are

$$f_-(x, z) = \frac{3(z-a)^{1/2}}{2(x-a)^{3/2}}, \quad \forall a \leq z < x \leq b \quad \text{and} \quad f_+(x, z) = \frac{3(b-z)^{1/2}}{2(b-x)^{3/2}}, \quad \forall a \leq x < z \leq b.$$

Similarly, when $h(x, \xi) = (x - \xi)^2$ and $F(z)$ is a normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(a, b^2)$, the optimal choice of f_- and f_+ are (it is easy to show that the integrals on the bottom are finite)

$$f_-(x, z) = \frac{\sqrt{\Phi\left(\frac{z-a}{b}\right)}}{\int_{-\infty}^x \sqrt{\Phi\left(\frac{z-a}{b}\right)}dz} \quad \forall z < x \quad \text{and} \quad f_+(x, z) = \frac{\sqrt{1-\Phi\left(\frac{z-a}{b}\right)}}{\int_x^\infty \sqrt{1-\Phi\left(\frac{z-a}{b}\right)}dz} \quad \forall z > x$$

where $\Phi(\cdot)$ is the c.d.f. of a standard normal distribution.

However, in many cases, the optimal choice of f_- and f_+ may not exist due to either 1) $\sqrt{F(z)}|h''_{x,z}(x, z)|$ or $\sqrt{1-F(z)}|h''_{x,z}(x, z)|$ is not integrable, or 2) the integration is 0 (e.g., in the case when $h(x, \xi)$ is piecewise linear in x and ξ). In those cases, either the optimal f_- and f_+ are not attainable, or the choice of f_- and f_+ does not matter (e.g., in the piecewise linear case⁷). Moreover, finding the optimal f_- and f_+ essentially needs the knowledge of the distribution of ξ , which is not known in advance. Therefore, one can only use an approximate (or prior) distribution of ξ to calculate the distribution.⁸ In addition, sampling from the distributions described above usually involves much more computational efforts than sampling from a uniform distribution or an exponential distribution, the overhead of which may well overshadow the improvement of the convergence speed. Therefore, in practice, choosing a heuristic sampling distribution f_- and f_+ may be more preferable, such as the uniform or exponential distributions described earlier in this section. Indeed, as we will see in later in Section 5, using uniform or exponential distributions lead to efficient solutions in our test cases.

4. Extensions

In this section, we discuss a few extensions of our comparison-based algorithms. In particular, in Section 4.1, we extend our discussions to multi-dimensional problems with quadratic objective

⁷ In the piecewise linear case, the comparative information between x and ξ will imply the knowledge of the stochastic gradient at the current sample point, and the gradient does not depend on the choice of f_- and f_+ functions.

⁸ Such issues are common in variance reduction problems in simulation. The optimal choice to reduce variance relies on the knowledge of the underlying distribution. See, e.g., Asmussen and Glynn (2007).

functions. In Section 4.2, we consider the case in which the objective function is not a convex function. In Section 4.3, we consider the case in which multiple samples can be drawn and multiple comparisons can be conducted in each iteration. We also consider a case in which categorical results (depending on the difference between the decision point and the sampled point) instead of binary results can be obtained from each comparison in Appendix C. Overall, we show that our proposed ideas can still be applied in those settings (with some variations).

4.1. Multi-Dimensional Convex Quadratic Problem

In this section, we extend our model to a multi-dimensional convex quadratic problem and propose a stochastic optimization algorithm for such a setting based on comparative information. Specifically, we consider the following stochastic convex optimization problem

$$\min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} H(x) = \mathbb{E}_{\xi} \left[h(x, \xi) := \frac{1}{2}(x - \xi)^{\top} Q(x - \xi) \right], \quad (10)$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a random variable, Q is a positive definite matrix and \mathcal{X} is a closed convex set in \mathbb{R}^d .

We denote the gradient of H by $\nabla H(x) := \mathbb{E}Q(x - \xi)$, the directional derivative of $h(x, \xi)$ along a direction $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$ by $\nabla_u h(x, \xi) := u^{\top} Q(x - \xi)$, and the gradient of $h(x, \xi)$ with respect to x by $\nabla h(x, \xi) := Q(x - \xi)$. The following assumption is made in this section:

ASSUMPTION 2. *There exists a constant K_4 such that $\mathbb{E}\|\xi - \mathbb{E}\xi\|_2^2 \leq K_4^2$.*

This assumption simply requires that ξ has a finite variance, which is not hard to satisfy in practice.

Suppose we can generate a random vector u in \mathbb{R}^d that satisfies $\mathbb{E}(uu^{\top}) = I_d$, where I_d is the $d \times d$ identity matrix. We will have $\mathbb{E}_u u \nabla_u h(x, \xi) = \mathbb{E}_u uu^{\top} Q(x - \xi) = \nabla h(x, \xi)$. Hence, to construct an unbiased stochastic gradient for $H(x)$, we only need to construct an unbiased stochastic estimation for $u^{\top} Q(x - \xi)$ and multiply it to u . In the following, we show that this can be done by first comparing $x + zu$ and $x - zu$ (in the value of $h(\cdot, \xi)$) with a random positive number z and then comparing the better one between $x + zu$ and $x - zu$ with x . In other words, we can still construct a stochastic gradient for $H(x)$ in (10) using two comparisons.

Similar as Example 1, this problem may still represent a problem of finding the average features of a group of customers. In particular, in such problems, x may represent d features (e.g., size, taste, etc.) of a product while ξ is the preference of a random customer on those features. The firm would like to find the optimal features to minimize the expected customer dissatisfaction which is measured by $h(x, \xi)$ in (10). Suppose the current product is x . To implement the two comparisons above, the firm can generate a random change u and a random level z and then ask a customer for

his/her preference between two new products $x + zu$ and $x - zu$ and his/her preference between the better new product and the current product.

We call this method comparison-based algorithm for quadratic problem (CBA-QP) and provide its details in Algorithm 3. In CBA-QP, we need to specify a density function $f(z)$ on $[0, +\infty)$, which needs to satisfy the following condition.

- (C4) There exists a constant K_5 such that for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$\int_0^{+\infty} \frac{\text{Prob}\left(\frac{\lambda_{\max}(Q)\|x-\xi\|_2}{\lambda_{\min}(Q)\sqrt{d}} \geq z\right)}{f(z)} dz = \int \int_0^{\frac{\lambda_{\max}(Q)\|x-\xi\|_2}{\lambda_{\min}(Q)\sqrt{d}}} \frac{1}{f(z)} dz dF(\xi) \leq K_5$$

where $\lambda_{\max}(Q)$ and $\lambda_{\min}(Q)$ are the largest and smallest eigenvalues of Q , respectively.

Below we give two examples of choices of $f(z)$ such that it satisfies condition (C4).

EXAMPLE 7 (UNIFORM SAMPLING DISTRIBUTION). Suppose Ξ (the support of ξ) and the feasible set \mathcal{X} are both bounded. The quantity $R := \frac{\lambda_{\max}(Q)}{\lambda_{\min}(Q)\sqrt{d}} \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}, \xi \in \Xi} \|x - \xi\|_2$ is finite. We can set $f(z)$ to be the density function of a uniform distribution on $[0, R]$, i.e.,

$$f(z) = \begin{cases} 1/R & 0 \leq z \leq R \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

With this choice, we have

$$\int \int_0^{\frac{\lambda_{\max}(Q)\|x-\xi\|_2}{\lambda_{\min}(Q)\sqrt{d}}} \frac{1}{f(z)} dz dF(\xi) \leq R^2,$$

thus (C4) is satisfied with $K_5 = R^2$.

EXAMPLE 8 (EXPONENTIAL SAMPLING DISTRIBUTION). Suppose ξ follows a light tail distribution with $\mathbb{E} \exp(\|\xi\|_2) \leq \bar{\sigma}$ for some $\bar{\sigma} > 0$. Moreover, suppose the feasible set \mathcal{X} is bounded. Then we can choose $f(z)$ to be an exponential distribution, i.e.,

$$f(z) = \begin{cases} 0 & z < 0 \\ \lambda \exp(-\lambda z) & z \geq 0, \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

where λ can be any positive constant less than $c := \frac{\sqrt{d}\lambda_{\min}(Q)}{\lambda_{\max}(Q)}$. With this choice, we have

$$\int_0^{\frac{\lambda_{\max}(Q)\|x-\xi\|_2}{\lambda_{\min}(Q)\sqrt{d}}} \frac{1}{f(z)} dz \leq \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \exp\left(\frac{\lambda_{\max}(Q)\|x-\xi\|_2 \lambda}{\lambda_{\min}(Q)\sqrt{d}}\right) \leq \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \exp\left(\frac{\lambda \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \|x\|_2}{c}\right) \exp\left(\frac{\lambda \|\xi\|_2}{c}\right).$$

By the light tail assumption and the concavity of $(\cdot)^{\lambda/c}$, we can use Jensen's inequality to show that $\mathbb{E} \exp\left(\frac{\lambda \|\xi\|_2}{c}\right) \leq [\mathbb{E} \exp(\|\xi\|_2)]^{\frac{\lambda}{c}} \leq \bar{\sigma}^{\frac{\lambda}{c}}$. Using this inequality, we further have

$$\int \int_0^{\frac{\lambda_{\max}(Q)\|x-\xi\|_2}{\lambda_{\min}(Q)\sqrt{d}}} \frac{1}{f(z)} dz dF(\xi) \leq \frac{\bar{\sigma}^{\frac{\lambda}{c}}}{\lambda^2} \exp\left(\frac{\lambda \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \|x\|_2}{c}\right),$$

thus (C4) is satisfied with $K_5 = \frac{\bar{\sigma}^{\frac{\lambda}{c}}}{\lambda^2} \exp\left(\frac{\lambda}{c} \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \|x\|_2\right)$.

Algorithm 3 CBA for Quadratic Problem (CBA-QP):

1. **Initialization.** Set $t = 1$, $x_1 \in \mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Define η_t for all $t \geq 1$. Set the maximum number of iterations T . Choose a density function $f(z)$ on $[0, +\infty)$. Let \mathcal{Q} be the uniform distribution on a sphere in \mathbb{R}^d with radius \sqrt{d} . Note that $\mathbb{E}uu^T = I_d$ for u following distribution \mathcal{Q} .

2. **Main iteration.** Sample ξ_t from the distribution of ξ . Sample u_t from \mathcal{Q} . Sample z_t from $f(z)$

(a) If $h(x_t + z_t u_t, \xi_t) < h(x_t - z_t u_t, \xi_t)$, set

$$g(x_t, \xi_t, u_t, z_t) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } h(x_t + z_t u_t, \xi_t) > h(x_t, \xi_t), \\ -\frac{1}{2} \frac{u_t^T Q u_t}{f(z_t)} u_t, & \text{if } h(x_t + z_t u_t, \xi_t) \leq h(x_t, \xi_t). \end{cases}$$

(b) If $h(x_t + z_t u_t, \xi_t) \geq h(x_t - z_t u_t, \xi_t)$, set

$$g(x_t, \xi_t, u_t, z_t) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } h(x_t - z_t u_t, \xi_t) > h(x_t, \xi_t), \\ \frac{1}{2} \frac{u_t^T Q u_t}{f(z_t)} u_t, & \text{if } h(x_t - z_t u_t, \xi_t) \leq h(x_t, \xi_t). \end{cases}$$

Let

$$x_{t+1} = \text{Proj}_{\mathcal{X}}(x_t - \eta_t g(x_t, \xi_t, u_t, z_t)). \quad (12)$$

3. **Termination.** Stop when $t \geq T$. Otherwise, let $t \leftarrow t + 1$ and go back to Step 2.

4. **Output.** $\text{CBA-QP}(x_1, T, \{\eta_t\}_{t=1}^T) = \bar{x}_T = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T x_t$.

The proposition below gives some properties of the stochastic gradient $g(x_t, \xi_t, u_t, z_t)$ in CBA-QP (see Algorithm 3):

PROPOSITION 5. *Let z , u , and g be defined in Algorithm 3. Then the following properties hold.*

1. $\mathbb{E}_{z,u} g(x, \xi, u, z) = \nabla h(x, \xi)$, for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$.
2. $\mathbb{E}_{z,u,\xi} g(x, \xi, u, z) = \nabla H(x)$, for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$.
3. $\mathbb{E}_{z,u,\xi} \|g(x, \xi, u, z) - \nabla H(x)\|_2^2 \leq \sigma^2 := \lambda_{\max}(Q)^2 K_4^2 + \frac{\lambda_{\max}(Q)^2 d^3 K_5}{4}$.

Proof of Proposition 5. First, we consider the case when $h(x + zu, \xi) < h(x - zu, \xi)$, which is equivalent to $u^T Q(x - \xi) < 0$ by the definition of h and the non-negativity of z . Note that $h(x + zu, \xi) \leq h(x, \xi)$ if and only if $zu^T Q(x - \xi) + \frac{z^2}{2} u^T Q u \leq 0$, or equivalently, $0 \leq z \leq -\frac{2u^T Q(x - \xi)}{u^T Q u}$.

It then follows from the definition of g that

$$\mathbb{E}_z g(x, \xi, u, z) = \int_0^{-\frac{2u^T Q(x - \xi)}{u^T Q u}} -\frac{1}{2} u^T Q u \cdot u dz = u^T Q(x - \xi) u = \nabla_u h(x, \xi) u.$$

Similarly, the second case $h(x + zu, \xi) \geq h(x - zu, \xi)$ occurs when $u^T Q(x - \xi) \geq 0$. The inequality $h(x - zu, \xi) \leq h(x, \xi)$ holds if and only if $-zu^T Q(x - \xi) + \frac{z^2}{2} u^T Q u \leq 0$, or equivalently, $0 \leq z \leq \frac{2u^T Q(x - \xi)}{u^T Q u}$. It then follows again from the definition of g that

$$\mathbb{E}_z g(x, \xi, u, z) = \int_0^{\frac{2u^T Q(x-\xi)}{u^T Q u}} \frac{1}{2} u^T Q u \cdot u dz = u^T Q(x-\xi)u = \nabla_u h(x, \xi)u.$$

Therefore, in both cases, we have $\mathbb{E}_z g(x, \xi, u, z) = \nabla_u h(x, \xi)u$. Since $\mathbb{E}(uu^T) = I_d$, further taking expectation over u on both sides of this equality gives the first conclusion of the proposition.

The second conclusion can be obtained by taking expectation over ξ on both sides of the first conclusion, namely, $\mathbb{E}_{z,u,\xi} g(x, \xi, u, z) = \mathbb{E}_\xi \mathbb{E}_{z,u} g(x, \xi, u, z) = \mathbb{E}_\xi \nabla h(x, \xi) = \nabla H(x)$. (This holds because h is a convex function, thus one can apply the monotone convergence theorem.)

Next, we prove the third conclusion. The first conclusion implies that

$$\mathbb{E}_{u,z} \|g(x, \xi, u, z) - \nabla h(x, \xi)\|^2 = \mathbb{E}_{u,z} \|g(x, \xi, u, z)\|^2 - \|\nabla h(x, \xi)\|^2.$$

If $h(x+zu, \xi) < h(x-zu, \xi)$, by the definition of g , we can show that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_z \|g(x, \xi, u, z)\|^2 &= \int_0^{-\frac{2u^T Q(x-\xi)}{u^T Q u}} \frac{(u^T Q u)^2}{4f(z)} \|u\|_2^2 dz \\ &\leq \int_0^{\frac{\lambda_{\max}(Q)\|u\|_2\|x-\xi\|_2}{\lambda_{\min}(Q)\|u\|_2^2}} \frac{\lambda_{\max}(Q)^2 \|u\|_2^4}{4f(z)} \|u\|_2^2 dz \\ &= \frac{\lambda_{\max}(Q)^2 d^3}{4} \int_0^{\frac{\lambda_{\max}(Q)\|x-\xi\|_2}{\lambda_{\min}(Q)\sqrt{d}}} \frac{1}{f(z)} dz, \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality is by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the second equality is because $\|u\| = \sqrt{d}$.

Similarly, if $h(x+zu, \xi) \geq h(x-zu, \xi)$, then we can also show that

$$\mathbb{E}_z \|g(x, \xi, u, z) - \nabla h(x, \xi)\|^2 \leq \frac{\lambda_{\max}(Q)^2 d^3}{4} \int_0^{\frac{\lambda_{\max}(Q)\|x-\xi\|_2}{\lambda_{\min}(Q)\sqrt{d}}} \frac{1}{f(z)} dz.$$

As a result, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{u,z} \|g(x, \xi, u, z) - \nabla h(x, \xi)\|^2 \leq \frac{\lambda_{\max}(Q)^2 d^3}{4} \int_0^{\frac{\lambda_{\max}(Q)\|x-\xi\|_2}{\lambda_{\min}(Q)\sqrt{d}}} \frac{1}{f(z)} dz.$$

According to this inequality and condition (C4), we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{z,u,\xi} \|g(x, \xi, u, z) - \nabla h(x, \xi)\|^2 \leq \frac{\lambda_{\max}(Q)^2 d^3}{4} \int \int_0^{\frac{\lambda_{\max}(Q)\|x-\xi\|_2}{\lambda_{\min}(Q)\sqrt{d}}} \frac{1}{f(z)} dz dF(\xi) \leq \frac{\lambda_{\max}(Q)^2 d^3 K_5}{4}.$$

In addition, by Assumption 2, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_\xi \|\nabla h(x, \xi) - \nabla H(x)\|_2^2 = \mathbb{E}_\xi \|Q(x-\xi) - Q(x-\mathbb{E}\xi)\|_2^2 \leq \lambda_{\max}(Q)^2 \mathbb{E}_\xi \|\xi - \mathbb{E}\xi\|_2^2 \leq \lambda_{\max}(Q)^2 K_4^2.$$

Finally, we note that

$$\mathbb{E}_{z,u,\xi} \|g(x, \xi, u, z) - \nabla H(x)\|_2^2 = \mathbb{E}_{z,u,\xi} \|g(x, \xi, u, z) - \nabla h(x, \xi)\|_2^2 + \mathbb{E}_\xi \|\nabla h(x, \xi) - \nabla H(x)\|_2^2.$$

Therefore, $\mathbb{E}_{z,u,\xi} \|g(x, \xi, u, z) - \nabla H(x)\|_2^2 \leq \sigma^2 := \lambda_{\max}(Q)^2 K_4^2 + \frac{\lambda_{\max}(Q)^2 d^3 K_5}{4}$. Thus the proposition holds. \square

Based on Proposition 5, we have the following proposition about the performance of CBA-QP.

PROPOSITION 6. *Let σ^2 be defined as in Proposition 5. Let x^* be any optimal solution to (10) and $\mu > 0$ and $L > 0$ be the smallest and largest eigenvalues of Q , respectively. Then by choosing $\eta_t = \frac{1}{\mu t + L}$, the CBA-QP ensures that*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(H(\bar{x}_T) - H(x^*)) &\leq \frac{\sigma^2 \log T + 1}{2\mu} + \frac{H(x_1) - H(x^*)}{T} + \frac{L\|x_1 - x^*\|_2^2}{2T}, \text{ and} \\ \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}(H(x_t) - H(x^*)) &\leq \frac{\sigma^2}{2\mu}(\log T + 1) + H(x_1) - H(x^*) + \frac{L\|x_1 - x^*\|_2^2}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Similar as to CBA, we can further improve the theoretical performance of CBA-QP using a restarting strategy as described in MCBA. We denote the resulting restarted algorithm by MCBA-QP.

Algorithm 4 Multi-stage Comparison-Based Algorithm for Quadratic Problem (MCBA-QP)

1. Initialize the number of stages $K \geq 1$, the starting solution \hat{x}^1 . Set $k = 1$.
 2. Let T_k be the number of iterations in stage k and η_t^k be the step length in iteration t of CBA-QP in stage k for $t = 1, 2, \dots, T_k$.
 3. Let $\hat{x}^{k+1} = \mathbf{CBA-QP}(\hat{x}^k, T_k, \{\eta_t^k\}_{t=1}^{T_k})$.
 4. Stop when $k \geq K$. Otherwise, let $k \leftarrow k + 1$ and go back to step 2.
 5. Output \hat{x}^{K+1} .
-

PROPOSITION 7. *Let σ^2 be defined as in Proposition 5, $\mu > 0$ and $L > 0$ be defined as in Proposition 6, and $T = \sum_{k=1}^K T_k$ with T_k defined in MCBA-QP. By choosing $\eta_t^k = \frac{1}{2^{k+1}\mu + L}$ and $T_k = 2^{k+3} + 4$, the MCBA-QP ensures that*

$$\mathbb{E}(H(\hat{x}_{K+1}) - H(x^*)) \leq \frac{32(H(\hat{x}_1) - H(x^*) + L\|\hat{x}_1 - x^*\|_2^2/2 + \sigma^2/\mu)}{T}.$$

The proofs of Proposition 6 and 7 are very similar to those of the second part of Proposition 3 and the second part of Proposition 4, respectively, and are provided in Appendix B.

Although we mainly focus on the quadratic problem for the multi-dimensional case, it is easy to see that our approach can also be applied to the multi-dimensional cases where the objective

function is separable with respect to each dimension while the constraint may not be separable. In particular, our method can be applied to the following problem

$$\min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} H(x) = \mathbb{E}_{\xi} \left[h(x, \xi) := \sum_{i=1}^d h_i(x_i, \xi_i) \right]$$

where $x = (x_1, \dots, x_d)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_d)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^d$, \mathcal{X} is a convex closed set in \mathbb{R}^d , and $h_i(x_i, \xi_i)$ is a function satisfying Assumption 1. In such cases, one can apply the idea of CBA to construct an unbiased stochastic gradient of each $h_i(x_i, \xi_i)$ based on comparisons and then concatenate them into an unbiased stochastic gradient of $h(x, \xi)$ in order to apply the projected gradient step (12). The resulting algorithm will have the same convergence rates as CBA under each setting in Proposition 2-4. Note that, we do not assume \mathcal{X} is separable so we still cannot solve the problem above as d independent problems.

4.2. Non-Convex Problem

The focus of our study in this paper is to construct an unbiased stochastic gradient based on comparative information. Once the construction is done, one can also apply the stochastic gradient to non-convex stochastic optimization problems. Although the stochastic gradient method can no longer guarantee to reach a global optimal solution for a non-convex problem, the recent result by Davis and Drusvyatskiy (2018) shows that the iterative solution generated by stochastic gradient method still converges to a nearly stationary point under some conditions.

In this section, we still consider one-dimensional problem (1) but $H(x)$ is no longer convex. More specifically, we still assume Assumption 1 holds except that Assumption (A4) is replaced by

(A4') $H(x)$ in (1) is differentiable and ρ -weakly convex on $[\ell, u]$ for some $\rho > 0$, namely,

$$H(x_2) \geq H(x_1) + H'(x_1)(x_2 - x_1) - \frac{\rho}{2}(x_2 - x_1)^2, \quad \forall x_1, x_2 \in [\ell, u]. \quad (13)$$

Moreover, $\mathbb{E}_{\xi}(h'_x(x, \xi)) = H'(x)$ for all $x \in [\ell, u]$.

For any $\lambda > 0$, the *Moreau envelope* for (1) is defined as a function

$$H_{\lambda}(x) := \min_{\ell \leq y \leq u} \left\{ H(y) + \frac{1}{2\lambda}(x - y)^2 \right\}. \quad (14)$$

By definition, as long as $\lambda < \frac{1}{\rho}$, the minimization problem (14) has a strongly convex objective function and has a unique solution, denoted by \hat{x} . Moreover, the function $H_{\lambda}(x)$ is continuously differentiable with the gradient given by $H'_{\lambda}(x) := \frac{1}{\lambda}(x - \hat{x})$. According to Davis and Drusvyatskiy (2018), the value of $|H'_{\lambda}(x)|$ measures the near stationarity of a solution $x \in [\ell, u]$ because

$$|x - \hat{x}| = \lambda |H'_{\lambda}(x)| \quad \text{and} \quad \text{dist}(0; \partial H(\hat{x})) \leq |H'_{\lambda}(x)|$$

where $\partial H(\hat{x})$ the subdifferential of H at x , i.e., the set of all v satisfying $H(y) \geq H(x) + v(y - x) + o(\|y - x\|)$ as $y \rightarrow x$ and $\text{dist}(x; A)$ is the nearest distance between point x and set A defined as $\text{dist}(x; A) = \inf_{y \in A} \|x - y\|$. This means that if $|H'_\lambda(x)| = \frac{1}{\lambda}|x - \hat{x}|$ is small, then the solution x is closed to a point \hat{x} (because of small $|x - \hat{x}|$) which is nearly stationary (because of small $\text{dist}(0; \partial H(\hat{x}))$).

According to Davis and Drusvyatskiy (2018), in order to find a solution x with a small $|H'_\lambda(x)|$, we can still use CBA except that the output will be x_{t^*} where t^* is a random index such that $\mathbb{P}(t^* = t) = \frac{\eta_t}{\sum_{s=1}^T \eta_s}$ for $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$. Then, we have $\mathbb{E}|H'_\lambda(x_{t^*})|$ with $\lambda = \frac{1}{2\rho}$ converges to zero in a rate of $O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}})$. We state this result formally as follows.

PROPOSITION 8 (Corollary 2.2 by Davis and Drusvyatskiy 2018). *Suppose Assumption (A4) is replaced by Assumption (A4') and the optimal value of (1) is finite. Let G^2 be defined as in Proposition 1 and t^* be a random index such that $\mathbb{P}(t^* = t) = \frac{\eta_t}{\sum_{s=1}^T \eta_s}$ for $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$. By choosing $\eta_t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}$, the CBA ensures that*

$$\mathbb{E}|H'_{\frac{1}{2\rho}}(x_{t^*})|^2 \leq 2 \frac{(H_{\frac{1}{2\rho}}(x_1) - \min_{\ell \leq x \leq u} H(x)) + \rho G^2}{\sqrt{T}}.$$

Therefore, the comparison-based algorithm can be partly applied to non-convex problems.

REMARK 1. Recently, there has been growing interest on the convergence of first-order methods when the objective function is non-convex but satisfies the Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz (KL) property (Bolte et al. 2007, 2014, Attouch et al. 2010, Karimi et al. 2016, Noll 2014, Xu and Yin 2017, Li et al. 2017). A function $H(x)$ satisfies the KL property at a point x^* if there exists $\eta > 0$, a neighborhood U of x^* , and a concave function $\kappa : [0, \eta] \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ such that: (i) $\kappa(0) = 0$, (ii) κ is continuously differentiable on $(0, \eta)$, (iii) $\kappa'(\cdot) > 0$ on $(0, \eta)$, and (iv)

$$\kappa'(H(x) - H(x^*)) \cdot \text{dist}(0; \partial H(x^*)) \geq 1$$

for any $x \in U$ that satisfies $H(x^*) < H(x) < H(x^*) + \eta$. Existing results show that, if $H(x)$ is non-convex but satisfies the KL property, each bounded sequence generated by a first-order method converges to a stationary point x^* of $H(x)$, and the local convergence rate to x^* can be characterized by the geometry of κ near x^* (see, e.g., Proposition 3 in Attouch et al. 2010).

However, almost all existing studies on first-order methods under the KL property focus on deterministic cases. Since our approaches construct stochastic gradients, most of the existing results utilizing KL property cannot be directly applied to our problem. The only result we are aware of about stochastic gradient descent under the KL property is given by Karimi et al. (2016). However,

they make stronger assumptions than the KL property on the problem. In particular, they require that the problem be unconstrained, that the aforementioned neighborhood U be the entire space \mathbb{R} , and that κ be in the form of $\kappa(t) = c\sqrt{t}$ for some $c > 0$. If these conditions are satisfied by $H(x)$, the CBA can also find an ϵ -optimal solution within $O(1/\epsilon)$ iterations according to Theorem 4 in Karimi et al. (2016). This is because CBA is essentially a stochastic gradient descent method except that the stochastic gradient is constructed using comparative information.

4.3. Mini-Batch Method with Additional Comparisons

In this section, we consider the scenario where multiple comparisons can be conducted in each iteration. In such cases, a mini-batch technique can be implemented in CBA and MCBA to reduce the noise in stochastic gradient and improve the performance of the algorithms. In particular, we still compare ξ_t and x_t in iteration t in Algorithm 1. In case (a) where $\xi_t < x_t$, we generate S independent samples, denoted by z_t^s for $s = 1, 2, \dots, S$, from a distribution on $(-\infty, x_t]$ with p.d.f. $f_-(x_t, z)$ and construct a stochastic gradient $g(x_t, \xi_t, z_t^s)$ as in (3) with z_t replaced by z_t^s . Similarly, in case (b) where $\xi_t > x_t$, we generate z_t^s from a distribution on $[x_t, +\infty)$ with p.d.f. $f_+(x_t, z)$ and construct $g(x_t, \xi_t, z_t^s)$ as in (4) with z_t replaced by z_t^s . After obtaining $g(x_t, \xi_t, z_t^s)$ in either case, we replace (5) in CBA with the following two steps

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{g}_t &= \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S g(x_t, \xi_t, z_t^s) \\ x_{t+1} &= \text{Proj}_{[\ell, u]}(x_t - \eta_t \bar{g}_t) = \max(\ell, \min(u, x_t - \eta_t \bar{g}_t)).\end{aligned}$$

Here, \bar{g}_t is the average gradient constructed by a mini-batch, which satisfies $\mathbb{E}_{z_t^s, s=1, \dots, S, \xi_t} \bar{g}_t = H'(x_t)$ by conclusion 2 in Proposition 1 and has a smaller noise than $g(x_t, \xi_t, z_t)$. MCBA can also benefit from this technique by calling CBA after the aforementioned modification.

This mini-batch technique will not improve the asymptotic convergence rate of CBA and MCBA because it will not completely eliminate the noise in the stochastic gradient. However, by reducing the noise, it will improve the algorithm's performance in practice as we demonstrate in Section 5.3.⁹

5. Numerical Tests

In this section, we conduct numerical experiments to show that although much less information is used, the proposed algorithms based only on comparative information converge at the same rate

⁹ Note that in the mini-batch method, the multiple samples are drawn simultaneously. It is worth noting that it is also possible to draw multiple samples sequentially, each one depending on the results of all previous ones. However, that mechanism will be quite complex. Moreover, the asymptotic performance will not improve because it will not surpass the asymptotic performance when the samples can be directly observed (which is already achieved by our current algorithm with two comparisons). Therefore, we here only choose to present the mini-batch approach.

as the stochastic gradient methods. We will also investigate the impact of choices of f_- and f_+ and the impact of mini-batch on the performances of the proposed methods. We implemented all algorithms in MATLAB running on a 64-bit Microsoft Windows 10 machine with a 2.70 Ghz Intel Core i7-6820HQ CPU and 8GB of memory.

5.1. Convergence of Objective Value

In this section, we conduct numerical experiments to test the performance of the CBA and the MCBA. We consider two objective functions:

$$1) \quad h_1(x, \xi) = (x - \xi)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad 2) \quad h_2(x, \xi) = \begin{cases} (x - \xi)^2 + (x - \xi) & \text{if } \xi < x \\ 2(x - \xi)^2 + 2(\xi - x) & \text{if } \xi \geq x \end{cases}.$$

Here the two objective functions correspond to the two examples we described in the beginning with h_1 being smooth but not h_2 . For each choice of $h(x, \xi)$, we consider two distributions of ξ , a uniform distribution $\mathcal{U}[50, 150]$ and a normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(100, 100)$. Thus we have four cases in total. It is easy to see that for the first objective function, the optimal solution under either underlying distribution is $x^* = 100$. For the second objective function, the optimal solution under the uniform distribution is $x^* = 108.66$ while the optimal solution under the normal distribution is $x^* = 102.82$. In all experiments, we choose the feasible set to be $[\ell, u] = [50, 150]$. For the cases where $\xi \sim \mathcal{U}[50, 150]$, we choose f_- and f_+ to be uniform distributions as in Example 5 with $\ell = 50$ and $u = 150$. For the cases where $\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(100, 100)$, we choose f_- and f_+ to be exponential distributions as in Example 6 with $\lambda_+ = \lambda_- = 2^{-4} = 0.0625$. (Later in Section 5.2 we will test the effect of choosing different f_- and f_+ on the convergence speed of the algorithms.)

In each of the four settings above, Assumption 1 holds with both A5(a) and A5(b) satisfied, and $H(x)$ is strongly convex. To compare the performance of the CBA with or without utilizing the strong convexity of the problem, we test both step lengths $\eta_t = 1/\sqrt{t}$ and $\eta_t = 1/(\mu t)$ for the CBA as suggested by Proposition 2 and Proposition 3. For the MCBA, we use the step sizes $\eta_t^k = 1/(2^{k+1}\mu)$ and $T_k = 2^{k+3}$ as suggested by Proposition 4. We choose $\mu = 0.5$ in all settings.

In the following, we compare the CBA and the MCBA with the standard stochastic gradient descent (SGD) method (see Nemirovski et al. 2009, Duchi and Singer 2009). In the standard SGD method, it is assumed that ξ_t can be observed directly and the stochastic gradient update step $x_{t+1} = \text{Proj}_{[\ell, u]}(x_t - \eta_t h'_x(x_t, \xi_t))$ is performed in each iteration. In the experiments, we apply the same step lengths in the SGD method as in the CBA. In all tests, we start from a random initial point $x_1 \sim \mathcal{U}[50, 150]$ and run each algorithm for $T = 500$ iterations and we report the average relative optimality gap $\delta_t = \frac{H(\bar{x}_t) - H(x^*)}{H(x^*)}$ over 2000 independent trails for each t . The results are reported in Figure 1.




Figure 1 The convergence of the average relative optimality gap for different algorithms for the four instances. **First row:** $h_1(x, \xi)$; **Second row:** $h_2(x, \xi)$. **First column:** $\xi \sim \mathcal{U}[50, 150]$; **Second column:** $\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(100, 100)$.

In Figure 1, the x -axis represents the number of iterations and the y -axis represents the average relative optimality gap for each algorithm. The curves **CBA** and **SGD** represent the results of CBA and SGD with $\eta_t = 1/\sqrt{t}$ respectively while the curves **CBAstc** and **SGDstc** represent the results of CBA and SGD with $\eta_t = 1/(\mu t)$ respectively. The curve **MCBA** represents the results of the MCBA algorithm. In each of the curves, the bar at each point represents the standard error of the corresponding δ_t . As one can see, the standard errors are fairly small. Thus the test results are quite stable in these numerical experiments. We also present the average computation time of all algorithms in Table 3.

Algorithm	$h_1(x, \xi)$		$h_2(x, \xi)$	
	$\xi \sim \mathcal{U}[50, 150]$	$\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(100, 100)$	$\xi \sim \mathcal{U}[50, 150]$	$\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(100, 100)$
SGD	0.008	0.007	0.010	0.040
SGDstc	0.007	0.007	0.009	0.038
CBA	0.011	0.018	0.013	0.049
CBAstc	0.011	0.017	0.013	0.045
MCBA	0.013	0.021	0.017	0.055

Table 1 The computation time (in seconds) of different algorithms for 500 iterations for the four instances.

From the results shown in Figure 1, we can see that all of CBA, CBAsc and MCBA converge quite fast in these problems. Even though they use much less information than the SGD and the SGDsc methods, it takes only about twice as many iterations to get the same accuracy. As shown in Table 3, the computation time for 500 iterations is less than 0.1 seconds in each algorithm and the time is not much different across different algorithms. (This short runtime is because of the low dimensionality of the problems.) Moreover, in our tests, CBA, CBAsc and MCBA have quite similar performance despite their different theoretical guarantees.¹⁰

5.2. Choices of f_- and f_+

In this section, we perform some additional tests to study the impact of different choices of f_- and f_+ on the performance of the CBA. We still consider the two objective functions considered in the last section, but we focus on the case in which $\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(100, 100)$. First we keep f_- and f_+ to be exponential distributions (as in Example 6) and see how the performance is affected by different values of $\lambda_- = \lambda_+ = \lambda$. The results are shown in Figure 2.




Figure 2 The impact of λ in f_+ and f_- to different algorithms, measured by the average relative optimality gap after 500 iterations. **Left:** $h_1(x, \xi)$; **Right:** $h_2(x, \xi)$. In both cases, $\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(100, 100)$.

In Figure 2, the x -axis represents the value of $\log_2 \lambda$ while the y -axis represents the relative optimality gap δ_T after 500 iterations evaluated as the average value of 2000 independent trials

¹⁰ Note that in Figure 1, the CBA and the CBAsc sometimes perform even better than the MCBA despite the worse theoretical guarantee. In fact, this is common in convex optimization literature for such types of (restarting) methods. For example, Chen et al. (2012) proposed a stochastic gradient method called MORDA, which improves ORDA in the same paper in theoretical convergence rate using a similar restarting technique to our MCBA method. However, in the fourth column of Table 2 in Chen et al. (2012), the objective value in MORDA is higher than that in ORDA. Similarly, Lan and Ghadimi (2012) developed a stochastic gradient method called Multistage AC-SA, which improves AC-SA in theoretical convergence rate but not necessarily in numerical performance (see Table 4.3 in Lan and Ghadimi 2012).

(again the bars show the standard error in these trials). The influences of different values of λ in f_- and f_+ are presented for the CBA, the CBAsc and the MCBA algorithms. We can see that the value of λ does influence the convergence speed of the algorithms. Particularly, in both figures in Figure 2, the optimality gap after $T = 500$ iterations decreases first as λ increases but starts to increase when λ is large. Moreover, the influence is relatively small when λ is small but is large when λ is large. And the influence is more pronounced for the CBAsc algorithm. In our setting, the best performance is obtained around $\lambda = 2^{-4} = 0.0625$ for all algorithms.

In Section 3, we provided the optimal choice of f_- and f_+ in (8) and (9). In Figure 3, we present the difference in the performances of the CBA when f_- and f_+ are chosen optimally versus when they are chosen as exponential distributions with $\lambda_- = \lambda_+ = 0.0625$. In this experiment, we choose $h(x, \xi) = h_1(x, \xi)$ and run the CBA for 500 iterations and compute the average relative optimality gap δ_{500} over 2000 independent trials. The results are plotted in Figure 3.




Figure 3 The convergence of the average relative optimality gap in CBA when choosing f_+ and f_- to be the exponential distribution and the optimal distribution in (8) and (9). Left: $\xi \sim \mathcal{U}[50, 150]$; Right: $\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(100, 100)$. In both cases, $h(x, \xi) = (x - \xi)^2$.

In Figure 3, we can see that the optimal choice of f_- and f_+ does improve the performance of the CBA, which confirms our analysis in Section 3. However, the improvement is not essential yet generating samples from the optimal distribution is much more time consuming. For example, when $\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(100, 100)$, the computational time is less than 0.05 seconds when using exponential distribution but about 1 second when using the optimal distribution. Therefore, as we discussed in the end of Section 3, one can just choose a simple distribution in practice.

5.3. Mini-Batch Method with Additional Comparisons

In this section, we numerically test how the performance of CBA depends on the sample size S in the mini-batch technique described in Section 4.3. The instances and the choice of parameters are all identical to Section 5.1. We present the convergence of CBA with $S = 1, 2, 5, 10, 100$ in Figure 4 and the associated runtimes in Table 2. According to the figures, one additional comparison (i.e. $S = 2$) with z can improve the convergence of Algorithm 1 in all four instances. Although increasing S can still improve the performance further, the effect diminishes quickly. This is because the noise in the stochastic gradient is generated from the sample noise of both ξ and z . The mini-batch technique for sampling z does not help reduce the noise due to ξ , which eventually dominates the noise due to z when S is large enough.¹¹ Although a similar mini-batch technique can be applied to ξ , it might not be practical when applying our algorithm in practice. For example, when ξ represents the ideal product of a customer, creating a mini-batch for ξ means asking different customers' preference without updating the solution, which is not consistent with the setting of online optimization where the solution is updated after the visit of each customer.

S	$h_1(x, \xi)$		$h_2(x, \xi)$	
	$\xi \sim \mathcal{U}[50, 150]$	$\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(100, 100)$	$\xi \sim \mathcal{U}[50, 150]$	$\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(100, 100)$
1	0.011	0.018	0.013	0.049
2	0.015	0.022	0.020	0.053
5	0.021	0.025	0.022	0.057
10	0.026	0.033	0.029	0.064
100	0.117	0.158	0.125	0.175

Table 2 The computation time (in seconds) of CBA for 500 iterations when using different numbers of comparisons (S) per iteration.

5.4. Multi-Dimensional Problems

In this section, we conduct numerical experiments to test the performance of the CBA-QP and the MCBA-QP on the multi-dimensional stochastic quadratic program (10). To generate a testing instance of (10), we first generate a $d \times d$ matrix Q' where each entry is sampled from an i.i.d. standard normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and then set $Q = (Q')^\top Q' / d + I_d$ in (10), where I_d is a $d \times d$ identity matrix. We choose the random variable ξ in (10) with a multivariate normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(100\mathbf{1}_d, 50^2 I_d)$, where $\mathbf{1}_d$ is the all-one vector in \mathbb{R}^d . It is easy to show that, with this choice, Assumption 2 holds and we have $\mathbb{E} \exp(\|\xi\|_2) \leq \bar{\sigma}$ for some $\bar{\sigma} > 0$ so that we can choose f in

¹¹ In Appendix D, we also present numerical results of convergence with mini-batch method with respect to runtime of the algorithm. The results show that choosing a small batch size can usually lead to fastest convergence (in terms of time). This is because of the tradeoff between the reduced number of iterations required in the mini-batch method and the increased computational efforts required in each iteration.




Figure 4 The convergence of the average relative optimality gap in CBA when using different numbers of comparisons (S). First row: $h_1(x, \xi)$; Second row: $h_2(x, \xi)$. First column: $\xi \sim \mathcal{U}[50, 150]$; Second column: $\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(100, 100)$.

Algorithms 6 and 7 to be an exponential distribution in order to guarantee (C4) according to Example 8. More specifically, we choose f to be the exponential distribution (11) with $\lambda = 2^{-4} = 0.0625$ (same as λ_+ and λ_- in Section 5.1). Finally, we choose the feasible set of (10) to be the box $\mathcal{X} = \prod_1^d [50, 150]$.

We compare the performance of the SGD, CBA-QP and MCBA-QP methods. In the SGD method, each iteration computes $x_{t+1} = \text{Proj}_{\mathcal{X}}(x_t - \eta_t Q(x_t - \xi_t))$ where ξ_t is sampled from the distribution of ξ and $Q(x_t - \xi_t)$ is the gradient of $h(x, \xi)$ with respect to x . As suggested by Proposition 6, we choose $\eta_t = 1/(\mu t + L)$ in CBA-QP where μ and L are the smallest and largest eigenvalues of Q , respectively. For MCBA, we choose $\eta_t^k = \frac{1}{2^{k+1}\mu + L}$ and $T_k = 2^{k+3} + 4$ as suggested by Proposition 7. In the experiments, we apply the same step lengths in the SGD method as in the CBA-QP method.

We randomly generate Q in the aforementioned method, start each algorithm at the same initial point x_1 that is uniformly randomly sampled in the box \mathcal{X} , and run each algorithm for $T = 2000$

iterations. We report the average relative optimality gap $\delta_t = \frac{H(\bar{x}_t) - H(x^*)}{H(x^*)}$ and its standard error over 2000 independent trails for each t . We run these experiments with the dimension $d = 5$ and $d = 20$. The results are reported in Figure 5.




Figure 5 The convergence of the average relative optimality gap for different algorithms for the multi-dimensional quadratic program (10). Left: $d = 5$; Right: $d = 20$.

From the results shown in Figure 5, we see that even though CBA-QP and MCBA-QP use much less information than the SGD method, they can eventually find a solution with an accuracy comparable to SGD. As shown in Table 3, the computation time for 2000 iterations is less than one second in each algorithm and the time is not much different across different algorithms. (This short runtime is because of the low dimensionality of the problems.) Moreover, in our tests, MCBA-QP has a faster convergence rate than CBA-QP which is consistent with Proposition 6 and 7. However, CBA-QP and MCBA-QP converge more slowly than SGD. This is because SGD utilizes the information of ξ with the full dimension while CBA-QP and MCBA-QP can only exploit information along a random direction u . This difference is more significant as the dimension increases, which is confirmed by Figure 5.

Algorithm	$d = 5$	$d = 20$
SGD	0.236	0.344
CBA-QP	0.391	0.490
MCBA-QP	0.440	0.585

Table 3 The computation time (in seconds) of different algorithms for 2000 iterations for the four instances.

6. Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we considered a stochastic optimization problem when neither the underlying uncertain parameters nor the objective value at the sampled point can be observed. Instead, the decision

maker can only access to comparative information between the sample point and two chosen decision points in each iteration. We proposed an algorithm that gives unbiased gradient estimates for this problem, which achieves the same asymptotic convergence rate as standard stochastic gradient methods. Numerical experiments demonstrate that our proposed algorithm is efficient.

There is one remark we would like to make. In this paper, we assumed that ξ follows a continuous distribution. However, we only need that in each iteration, the probability that $\xi_t = x_t$ is 0. This can be guaranteed by only requiring $\mathbb{P}(\xi = \ell) = \mathbb{P}(\xi = u) = 0$, and then in the CBA, adding a small and decaying random perturbation to $g(x_t, \xi_t, z_t)$ (for example, a uniform distribution on $[-1/2^t, 1/2^t]$ in iteration t). By doing this, one can still use the same analysis, and the same performance guarantee holds for the modified algorithm.

There are several future directions of research. First, for multi-dimensional problems, we only considered convex quadratic problems in this paper (as mentioned in Section 4.1, we can also generalize our method to separable objective function cases). It would be of interest to see whether the ideas and techniques can be generalized to more general multi-dimensional settings. Second, in this paper, we assumed that the distribution of ξ is stationary over time, and the comparative information is always reported accurately. However, in practice, the distribution of ξ may change over time or the comparative information may be reported in a noisy fashion. It would be interesting to see whether we could extend our discussions to consider such situations. Finally, our paper only considers a continuous decision setting, i.e., we assumed that all the decision variables as well as the test variables can take any continuous values. In many practical situations, the decision variables may only be chosen from a finite set. It is worth further research to see whether a similar idea can be applied in such settings.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank the editor-in-chief, the associated editor and three anonymous referees for many useful suggestions and feedback. Xi Chen was supported by the NSF IIS-18454444, the Alibaba Innovation Research Award, and the Bloomberg Data Science Research Grant.

References

- Asmussen, S., P. W. Glynn. 2007. *Stochastic Simulation*. Springer.
- Attouch, H., J. Bolte, P. Redont, A. Soubeyran. 2010. Proximal alternating minimization and projection methods for nonconvex problems: An approach based on the Kurdyka-Lojasiewicz inequality. *Mathematics of Operations Research* **35**(2) 438–457.
- Ban, G.-Y., C. Rudin. 2018. The big data newsvendor: Practical insights from machine learning. *Operations Research* Forthcoming.

-
- Bensoussan, A., M. Çakanyildirim, S. P. Sethi. 2007. A multiperiod newsvendor problem with partially observed demand. *Mathematics of Operations Research* **32**(2) 322–344.
- Besbes, O., A. Muharremoglu. 2013. On implications of demand censoring in the newsvendor problem. *Management Science* **59**(6) 1407–1424.
- Bolte, J., A. Daniilidis, A. Lewis. 2007. The Łojasiewicz inequality for nonsmooth subanalytic functions with applications to subgradient dynamical systems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* **17**(4) 1205–1223.
- Bolte, J., S. Sabach, M. Teboulle. 2014. Proximal alternating linearized minimization for nonconvex and nonsmooth problems. *Mathematical Programming* **146**(1-2) 459–494.
- Cachon, G., R. Swinney. 2011. The value of fast fashion: Quick response, enhanced design, and strategic consumer behavior. *Management Science* **57**(4) 579–595.
- Candogan, O., K. Bimpikis, A. Ozdaglar. 2012. Optimal pricing in networks with externalities. *Operations Research* **60**(4) 883–905.
- Cesa-Bianchi, N., G. Lugosi. 2006. *Prediction, Learning, and Games*. Cambridge University Press.
- Chen, X., Q. Lin, J. Pena. 2012. Optimal regularized dual averaging methods for stochastic optimization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **25**. 395–403.
- Davis, D., D. Drusvyatskiy. 2018. Stochastic subgradient method converges at the rate $O(k^{-1/4})$ on weakly convex functions. Working Paper.
- den Boer, A. V. 2015. Dynamic pricing and learning: Historical origins, current research, and new directions. *Surveys in Operations Research and Management Science* **20**(1) 1–18.
- Ding, X., M. Puterman, A. Bisi. 2002. The censored newsvendor and the optimal acquisition of information. *Operations Research* **50**(3) 517–527.
- Duchi, J., E. Hazan, Y. Singer. 2011. Adaptive subgradient methods for online learning and stochastic optimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **12** 2121–2159.
- Duchi, J., Y. Singer. 2009. Efficient online and batch learning using forward-backward splitting. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **10** 2873–2898.
- Gupta, D., B. Denton. 2008. Appointment scheduling in health care: Challenges and opportunities. *IIE Transactions* **40** 800–819.
- Halman, N., J. Orlin, D. Simchi-Levi. 2012. Approximating the nonlinear newsvendor and single-item stochastic lot-sizing problems when data is given by an oracle. *Operations Research* **60**(2) 429–446.
- Hazan, E., S. Kale. 2014. Beyond the regret minimization barrier: Optimal algorithms for stochastic strongly-convex optimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **15** 2489–2512.
- Hu, C., J. T. Kwok, W. Pan. 2009. Accelerated gradient methods for stochastic optimization and online learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **22**. 781–789.

-
- Karimi, H., J. Nutini, M. Schmidt. 2016. Linear convergence of gradient and proximal-gradient methods under the Polyak-Lojasiewicz condition. *Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*. Springer, 795–811.
- Kiefer, J., J. Wolfowitz. 1952. Stochastic estimation of the maximum of a regression function. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* **23**(3) 462–466.
- Kolker, A. 2017. *The Optimal Workforce Staffing Solutions With Random Patient Demand in Healthcare Settings*, chap. 322. IGI Global Information Science, 3711 – 3724.
- Lan, G. 2012. An optimal method for stochastic composite optimization. *Mathematical Programming* **133**(1-2) 365–397.
- Lan, G., S. Ghadimi. 2012. Optimal stochastic approximation algorithms for strongly convex stochastic composite optimization, Part I: A generic algorithmic framework. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* **22**(4) 1469–1492.
- Lan, G., S. Ghadimi. 2013. Optimal stochastic approximation algorithms for strongly convex stochastic composite optimization, Part II: Shrinking procedures and optimal algorithms. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* **23**(4) 2061–2089.
- Levi, R., G. Perakis, J. Uichanco. 2015. The data-driven newsvendor problem: New bounds and insights. *Operations Research* **63**(6) 1294–1306.
- Li, Q., Y. Zhou, Y. Liang, P. K. Varshney. 2017. Convergence analysis of proximal gradient with momentum for nonconvex optimization. Working Paper.
- Lin, Q., X. Chen, J. Pena. 2011. A sparsity preserving stochastic gradient method for composite optimization. Tech. rep., Carnegie Mellon University.
- Nemirovski, A., A. Juditsky, G. Lan, A. Shapiro. 2009. Robust stochastic approximation approach to stochastic programming. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* **19**(4) 1574–1609.
- Nemirovski, A., D. Yudin. 1983. *Problem Complexity and Method Efficiency in Optimization*. Wiley, New York.
- Noll, D. 2014. Convergence of non-smooth descent methods using the Kurdyka-Lojasiewicz inequality. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications* **160**(2) 553–572.
- Rakhlin, A., O. Shamir, K. Sridharan. 2012. Making gradient descent optimal for strongly convex stochastic optimization. *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Machine Learning*. 449–456.
- Robbins, H., S. Monro. 1951. A stochastic approximation method. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* **22**(3) 400–407.
- Shalev-Shwartz, S. 2012. Online learning and online convex optimization. *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning* **4**(2) 107–194.

-
- Shamir, O., T. Zhang. 2013. Stochastic gradient descent for non-smooth optimization: Convergence results and optimal averaging schemes. *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Machine Learning*. 71–79.
- Shapiro, A., D. Dentcheva, A. Ruszczyński. 2014. *Lectures on Stochastic Programming: Modeling and Theory*. SIAM.
- Widder, D. V. 1990. *Advanced Calculus*. Dover Publication Inc.
- Xiao, L. 2010. Dual averaging methods for regularized stochastic learning and online optimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **11** 2543–2596.
- Xu, Y., W. Yin. 2017. A globally convergent algorithm for nonconvex optimization based on block coordinate update. *Journal of Scientific Computing* **72**(2) 700–734.
- Zinkevich, M. 2003. Online convex programming and generalized infinitesimal gradient ascent. *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Machine Learning*. 928–936.

Appendix A: Proofs of Proposition 2, 3 and 4

Proof of Proposition 2. We prove the proposition by considering the case when Assumption A5(a) or A5(b) holds respectively. For the ease of notation, we shall use \mathbb{E}_t to denote the conditional expectation taken over ξ_t and z_t conditioning on $\xi_1, z_1, \xi_2, z_2, \dots, \xi_{t-1}, z_{t-1}$.

1. When Assumption A5(a) holds (based on Nemirovski et al. 2009, Duchi and Singer 2009):

According to (5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (x_{t+1} - x^*)^2 &= (\text{Proj}_{[\ell, u]}(x_t - \eta_t g(x_t, \xi_t, z_t)) - \text{Proj}_{[\ell, u]}(x^*))^2 \\ &\leq (x_t - \eta_t g(x_t, \xi_t, z_t) - x^*)^2 \\ &= (x_t - x^*)^2 - 2\eta_t g(x_t, \xi_t, z_t)(x_t - x^*) + \eta_t^2 (g(x_t, \xi_t, z_t))^2. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Taking expectation of (15) over ξ_t and z_t , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_t(x_{t+1} - x^*)^2 &= (x_t - x^*)^2 - 2\eta_t H'(x_t)(x_t - x^*) + \eta_t^2 \mathbb{E}_t(g(x_t, \xi_t, z_t))^2 \\ &\leq (1 - \eta_t \mu)(x_t - x^*)^2 - 2\eta_t (H(x_t) - H(x^*)) + \eta_t^2 \mathbb{E}_t(g(x_t, \xi_t, z_t))^2, \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where the first equality is because of Proposition 1 and the last inequality is because of (2) ($H(\cdot)$ is μ -convex).

According to the third statement in Proposition 1, (16) implies that

$$H(x_t) - H(x^*) \leq \frac{1 - \eta_t \mu}{2\eta_t} (x_t - x^*)^2 - \frac{1}{2\eta_t} \mathbb{E}_t(x_{t+1} - x^*)^2 + \frac{\eta_t G^2}{2}. \quad (17)$$

If $\mu = 0$ and we choose $\eta_t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}$, then summing (17) for $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$ and taking expectation give

$$T\mathbb{E}(H(\bar{x}_T) - H(x^*)) \leq \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}(H(x_t) - H(x^*)) \leq \frac{\sqrt{T}}{2} (x_1 - x^*)^2 + \frac{\sqrt{T}G^2}{2}.$$

The desired result for this part is obtained by dividing this inequality by T . In addition, if both u and ℓ are finite and we choose $\eta_t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}$, then summing (17) for $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$ and taking expectation give

$$T\mathbb{E}(H(\bar{x}_T) - H(x^*)) \leq \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}(H(x_t) - H(x^*)) \leq \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\sqrt{t} - \sqrt{t-1}}{2} (x_t - x^*)^2 + \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{G^2}{2\sqrt{t}}.$$

Note that $(x_t - x^*)^2 \leq (u - \ell)^2$ and $\sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} \leq \int_0^T \frac{1}{\sqrt{x}} dx = 2\sqrt{T}$ so that the above inequality implies

$$T\mathbb{E}(H(\bar{x}_T) - H(x^*)) \leq \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}(H(x_t) - H(x^*)) \leq \frac{\sqrt{T}}{2} (u - \ell)^2 + \sqrt{T}G^2.$$

The desired result for this part is obtained by dividing this inequality by T .

2. When Assumption A5(b) holds (based on Lan 2012):

The μ -convexity property (2) of $H(\cdot)$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned} H(x^*) &\geq H(x_t) + H'(x_t)(x^* - x_t) + \frac{\mu}{2}(x^* - x_t)^2 \\ &= H(x_t) + \mathbb{E}_t[g(x_t, \xi_t, z_t)(x^* - x_t)] + \frac{\mu}{2}(x^* - x_t)^2 \\ &= H(x_t) + \mathbb{E}_t[(g(x_t, \xi_t, z_t) - H'(x_t))(x_{t+1} - x_t)] + H'(x_t)(x_{t+1} - x_t) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_t[g(x_t, \xi_t, z_t)(x^* - x_{t+1})] + \frac{\mu}{2}(x^* - x_t)^2, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where the first equality is because of Proposition 1. By Assumption A5(b), $H'(x)$ is L -Lipschitz continuous, thus

$$H(x_{t+1}) \leq H(x_t) + H'(x_t)(x_{t+1} - x_t) + \frac{L}{2}(x_{t+1} - x_t)^2$$

which, together with (18), implies that

$$\begin{aligned} H(x^*) &\geq \mathbb{E}_t H(x_{t+1}) + \mathbb{E}_t [(g(x_t, \xi_t, z_t) - H'(x_t))(x_{t+1} - x_t)] - \frac{L}{2} \mathbb{E}_t (x_{t+1} - x_t)^2 \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_t [g(x_t, \xi_t, z_t)(x^* - x_{t+1})] + \frac{\mu}{2} (x^* - x_t)^2 \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}_t H(x_{t+1}) - \frac{1}{2a_t} \mathbb{E}_t (g(x_t, \xi_t, z_t) - H'(x_t))^2 - \frac{L + a_t}{2} \mathbb{E}_t (x_{t+1} - x_t)^2 \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_t [g(x_t, \xi_t, z_t)(x^* - x_{t+1})] + \frac{\mu}{2} (x^* - x_t)^2 \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}_t H(x_{t+1}) - \frac{\sigma^2}{2a_t} - \frac{L + a_t}{2} \mathbb{E}_t (x_{t+1} - x_t)^2 + \mathbb{E}_t [g(x_t, \xi_t, z_t)(x^* - x_{t+1})] + \frac{\mu}{2} (x^* - x_t)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where a_t is a positive constant, the second inequality is due to Young's inequality, namely, $xy \leq \frac{x^2}{2a} + \frac{ay^2}{2}$ for any $a > 0$, and the last equality is due to the third statement of Proposition 1. We will determine the value of a_t later but we always ensure that a_t and η_t satisfy

$$\frac{L + a_t}{2} - \frac{1}{2\eta_t} \leq 0. \quad (19)$$

By the optimality of x_{t+1} as a solution to the projection problem (5), we have

$$(x_{t+1} - x_t + \eta_t g(x_t, \xi_t, z_t))(x^* - x_{t+1}) \geq 0.$$

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} H(x^*) &\geq \mathbb{E}_t H(x_{t+1}) - \frac{\sigma^2}{2a_t} - \frac{L + a_t}{2} \mathbb{E}_t (x_{t+1} - x_t)^2 + \frac{1}{\eta_t} \mathbb{E}_t [(x_{t+1} - x_t)(x_{t+1} - x^*)] + \frac{\mu}{2} (x^* - x_t)^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E}_t H(x_{t+1}) - \frac{\sigma^2}{2a_t} - \left(\frac{L + a_t}{2} - \frac{1}{2\eta_t} \right) \mathbb{E}_t (x_{t+1} - x_t)^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2\eta_t} \mathbb{E}_t (x_{t+1} - x^*)^2 - \left(\frac{1}{2\eta_t} - \frac{\mu}{2} \right) \mathbb{E}_t (x_t - x^*)^2 \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}_t H(x_{t+1}) - \frac{\sigma^2}{2a_t} + \frac{1}{2\eta_t} \mathbb{E}_t (x_{t+1} - x^*)^2 - \left(\frac{1}{2\eta_t} - \frac{\mu}{2} \right) \mathbb{E}_t (x_t - x^*)^2, \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where the second inequality is from (19).

If $\mu = 0$ and we choose $\eta_t = \frac{1}{L + \sqrt{T}}$ and $a_t = \sqrt{T}$ so that (19) is satisfied. Summing (20) for $t = 1, 2, \dots, T-1$ and organizing terms give

$$T\mathbb{E}(H(\bar{x}_T) - H(x^*)) \leq \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}(H(x_t) - H(x^*)) \leq \frac{L + \sqrt{T}}{2} (x_1 - x^*)^2 + H(x_1) - H(x^*) + \frac{\sqrt{T}\sigma^2}{2}.$$

The desired result for this part is obtained by dividing this inequality by T . In addition, if both u and ℓ are finite and we choose $\eta_t = \frac{1}{L + \sqrt{t}}$ and $a_t = \sqrt{t}$, then summing (20) for $t = 1, 2, \dots, T-1$ and taking expectation give

$$\begin{aligned} T\mathbb{E}(H(\bar{x}_T) - H(x^*)) &\leq \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}(H(x_t) - H(x^*)) \\ &\leq \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \frac{\sqrt{t} - \sqrt{t-1}}{2} (x_t - x^*)^2 + H(x_1) - H(x^*) + \frac{L}{2} (x_1 - x^*)^2 + \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \frac{\sigma^2}{2\sqrt{t}}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $(x_t - x^*)^2 \leq (u - \ell)^2$ and $\sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} \leq \int_0^T \frac{1}{\sqrt{x}} dx = 2\sqrt{T}$ so that the above inequality implies

$$T\mathbb{E}(H(\bar{x}_T) - H(x^*)) \leq \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}(H(x_t) - H(x^*)) \leq \frac{\sqrt{T}}{2}(u - \ell)^2 + H(x_1) - H(x^*) + \frac{L}{2}(x_1 - x^*)^2 + \sqrt{T}\sigma^2.$$

The desired result for this part is obtained by dividing this inequality by T . \square

Proof of Proposition 3. Similar as to the proof of Proposition 2, we consider the case when Assumption A5(a) or A5(b) holds respectively, and use \mathbb{E}_t to denote the conditional expectation taken over ξ_t and z_t conditioning on $\xi_1, z_1, \xi_2, z_2, \dots, \xi_{t-1}, z_{t-1}$.

1. When Assumption A5(a) holds: We can still show (17) using exactly the same argument in the proof of Proposition 2.

If $\mu > 0$ and we choose $\eta_t = \frac{1}{\mu t}$, summing (17) for $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$ gives

$$T\mathbb{E}(H(\bar{x}_T) - H(x^*)) \leq \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}(H(x_t) - H(x^*)) \leq \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{G^2}{2\mu t}.$$

The desired result for this part is obtained by dividing this inequality by T and using the fact that $\sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{t} \leq \log T + 1$.

2. When Assumption A5(b) holds: Using exactly the same argument in the proof of Proposition 2, we can show that (20) holds for any positive constant a_t that satisfies (19).

If $\mu > 0$ and we choose $\eta_t = \frac{1}{\mu t + L}$ and $a_t = \mu t$ so that (19) is satisfied. Summing (20) for $t = 1, 2, \dots, T - 1$ gives

$$T\mathbb{E}(H(\bar{x}_T) - H(x^*)) \leq \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}(H(x_t) - H(x^*)) \leq \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\sigma^2}{2\mu t} + H(x_1) - H(x^*) + \frac{L(x_1 - x^*)^2}{2}.$$

The desired result for this part is obtained by dividing this inequality by T and using the fact that $\sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{t} \leq \log T + 1$. \square

Before we prove Proposition 4, we first introduce the following lemma:

LEMMA 1. *If Assumption A5(a) holds, then by choosing $\eta_t = \eta \in (0, +\infty)$, the CBA ensures that*

$$\mathbb{E}(H(\bar{x}_T) - H(x^*)) \leq \frac{(x_1 - x^*)^2}{2\eta T} + \frac{\eta G^2}{2}.$$

If Assumption A5(b) holds, then by choosing $\eta_t = \eta \in (0, \frac{1}{L})$ and $a_t = \frac{1}{\eta t} - L$, the CBA ensures that

$$\mathbb{E}(H(\bar{x}_T) - H(x^*)) \leq \frac{(x_1 - x^*)^2}{2\eta T} + \frac{H(x_1) - H(x^*)}{T} + \frac{\sigma^2}{1/\eta - L}.$$

Proof of Lemma 1. When Assumption A5(a) holds, by choosing $\eta_t = \eta \in (0, \infty)$ and summing (17) over $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$, we have

$$T\mathbb{E}(H(\bar{x}_T) - H(x^*)) \leq \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}(H(x_t) - H(x^*)) \leq \frac{(x_1 - x^*)^2}{2\eta} + \frac{T\eta G^2}{2}.$$

The first conclusion is obtained by dividing this inequality by T .

When Assumption A5(b) holds, by setting $\eta_t = \eta \in (0, \frac{1}{L})$, $a_t = \frac{1}{\eta} - L$ and summing (20) over $t = 1, 2, \dots, T-1$, we have

$$T\mathbb{E}(H(\bar{x}_T) - H(x^*)) \leq \frac{(x_1 - x^*)^2}{2\eta} + H(x_1) - H(x^*) + \frac{T\sigma^2}{1/\eta - L}.$$

The second conclusion is obtained by dividing this inequality by T . \square

Proof of Proposition 4. The optimality of x^* and the μ -convexity property (2) of $H(\cdot)$ imply

$$\frac{\mu}{2}(\hat{x}^k - x^*)^2 \leq H(\hat{x}^k) - H(x^*). \quad (21)$$

With a slight abuse of notation, let \mathbb{E}_k be the conditional expectation conditioning on $\hat{x}^1, \hat{x}^2, \dots, \hat{x}^k$.

1. When Assumption A5(a) holds (based on Hazan and Kale 2014):

Define $\Delta_k = H(\hat{x}^k) - H(x^*)$ for $k \geq 1$. In the following, we use induction to show $\mathbb{E}\Delta_k \leq \frac{\Delta_1 + G^2/\mu}{2^{k-1}}$ for $k \geq 1$. Note that this statement holds trivially when $k = 1$. Suppose $\mathbb{E}\Delta_k \leq \frac{\Delta_1 + G^2/\mu}{2^{k-1}}$. Now we consider $\mathbb{E}\Delta_{k+1}$.

By Lemma 1 and $\eta_t^k = \frac{1}{2^{k+1}\mu}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\Delta_{k+1} = \mathbb{E}_k(H(\hat{x}^{k+1}) - H(x^*)) \leq \frac{2^k\mu(\hat{x}^k - x^*)^2}{T_k} + \frac{G^2}{2^{k+2}\mu} \leq \frac{2^{k+1}\Delta_k}{T_k} + \frac{G^2}{2^{k+2}\mu},$$

where the second inequality is due to (21). Taking expectation over $\hat{x}^1, \hat{x}^2, \dots, \hat{x}^k$ and applying the induction assumption $\mathbb{E}\Delta_k = \frac{\Delta_1 + G^2/\mu}{2^{k-1}}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\Delta_{k+1} \leq \frac{2^{k+1}(\Delta_1 + G^2/\mu)}{T_k 2^{k-1}} + \frac{G^2}{2^{k+2}\mu} \leq \frac{\Delta_1}{2^{k+1}} + \frac{G^2}{2^{k+1}\mu} + \frac{G^2}{2^{k+2}\mu} \leq \frac{\Delta_1 + G^2/\mu}{2^k}, \quad (22)$$

where we use the facts that $T_k = 2^{k+3}$. By induction assumption, $\mathbb{E}\Delta_k \leq \frac{\Delta_1 + G^2/\mu}{2^{k-1}}$ for $k \geq 1$. Since $T = \sum_{k=1}^K T_k = \sum_{k=1}^K 2^{k+3} \leq 2^{K+4}$, we have $K \geq \log_2(T/16)$. Let $k = K$ in (22), we have

$$\mathbb{E}(H(\hat{x}^{K+1}) - H(x^*)) = \mathbb{E}\Delta_{K+1} \leq \frac{\Delta_1 + G^2/\mu}{2^K} \leq \frac{16(\Delta_1 + G^2/\mu)}{T}.$$

2. When Assumption A5(b) holds:

Define $\Delta_k = H(\hat{x}^k) - H(x^*) + \frac{L}{2}(\hat{x}^k - x^*)^2$ for $k \geq 1$. In the following, we use induction to show $\mathbb{E}\Delta_k \leq \frac{\Delta_1 + \sigma^2/\mu}{2^{k-1}}$ for $k \geq 1$. Note that this statement holds trivially when $k = 1$. Suppose $\mathbb{E}\Delta_k \leq \frac{\Delta_1 + \sigma^2/\mu}{2^{k-1}}$. Now we consider $\mathbb{E}\Delta_{k+1}$.

By Lemma 1 and $\eta_t^k = \frac{1}{2^{k+1}\mu + L} \in (0, \frac{1}{L})$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\Delta_{k+1} = \mathbb{E}_k(H(\hat{x}^{k+1}) - H(x^*)) \leq \frac{(2^{k+1}\mu + L)(\hat{x}^k - x^*)^2}{2T_k} + \frac{\Delta_k}{T_k} + \frac{\sigma^2}{2^{k+1}\mu} \leq (2^{k+1} + 1) \frac{\Delta_k}{T_k} + \frac{\sigma^2}{2^{k+1}\mu},$$

where the second inequality is due to (21). Taking expectation over $\hat{x}^1, \hat{x}^2, \dots, \hat{x}^k$ and applying the induction assumption $\mathbb{E}\Delta_k = \frac{\Delta_1 + \sigma^2/\mu}{2^{k-1}}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\Delta_{k+1} \leq (2^{k+1} + 1) \frac{\Delta_1 + \sigma^2/\mu}{T_k 2^{k-1}} + \frac{\sigma^2}{2^{k+1}\mu} \leq \frac{\Delta_1}{2^{k+1}} + \frac{\sigma^2}{2^{k+1}\mu} + \frac{\sigma^2}{2^{k+1}\mu} \leq \frac{\Delta_1 + \sigma^2/\mu}{2^k}, \quad (23)$$

where we use the facts that $T_k = 2^{k+3} + 4$. Thus, $\mathbb{E}\Delta_k \leq \frac{\Delta_1 + \sigma^2/\mu}{2^{k-1}}$ for $k \geq 1$. Since $T = \sum_{k=1}^K T_k = \sum_{k=1}^K (2^{k+3} + 4) \leq 2^{K+5}$, we have $K \geq \log_2(T/32)$. Let $k = K$ in (23), we have

$$\mathbb{E}(H(\hat{x}^{K+1}) - H(x^*)) = \mathbb{E}\Delta_{K+1} \leq \frac{\Delta_1 + \sigma^2/\mu}{2^K} = \frac{32(\Delta_1 + \sigma^2/\mu)}{T}.$$

Thus the proposition is proved. \square

Appendix B: Proofs of Proposition 6 and 7

Proof of Proposition 6. For the ease of notation, we shall use \mathbb{E}_t to denote the conditional expectation taken over ξ_t , u_t and z_t conditioning on $\xi_1, z_1, u_t, \xi_2, z_2, u_2, \dots, \xi_{t-1}, z_{t-1}, u_{t-1}$. The proof is similar to the proof of Proposition 2 when Assumption A5(b) holds.

Since μ is the smallest eigenvalues of Q and it is positive, $H(\cdot)$ defined in (10) is μ -convex, which implies (18) using Proposition 5. Moreover, since L is the largest eigenvalues of Q , $H'(x)$ is L -Lipschitz continuous so that

$$H(x_{t+1}) \leq H(x_t) + H'(x_t)(x_{t+1} - x_t) + \frac{L}{2}(x_{t+1} - x_t)^2$$

which, by Proposition 5 and the same argument in the proof of Proposition 2, implies that

$$H(x^*) \geq \mathbb{E}_t H(x_{t+1}) - \frac{\sigma^2}{2a_t} - \frac{L + a_t}{2} \mathbb{E}_t (x_{t+1} - x_t)^2 + \mathbb{E}_t [g(x_t, \xi_t, z_t)(x^* - x_{t+1})] + \frac{\mu}{2}(x^* - x_t)^2,$$

where a_t is a positive constant chosen to satisfy (19).

By the optimality of x_{t+1} as a solution to the projection problem (12), we have

$$(x_{t+1} - x_t + \eta_t g(x_t, \xi_t, z_t))(x^* - x_{t+1}) \geq 0.$$

Using this inequality and the same argument in the proof of Proposition 2 (under Assumption A5(b)), we can show that (20) holds.

Since $\mu > 0$ by assumption, we can choose $\eta_t = \frac{1}{\mu t + L}$ and $a_t = \mu t$ so that (19) is satisfied. Summing (20) for $t = 1, 2, \dots, T - 1$ gives

$$T\mathbb{E}(H(\bar{x}_T) - H(x^*)) \leq \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}(H(x_t) - H(x^*)) \leq \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\sigma^2}{2\mu t} + H(x_1) - H(x^*) + \frac{L(x_1 - x^*)^2}{2}.$$

The conclusion of this proposition is obtained by dividing this inequality by T and using the fact that $\sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{t} \leq \log T + 1$. \square

Proof of Proposition 7. The optimality of x^* and the μ -convexity of $H(\cdot)$ imply (21). Let \mathbb{E}_k be the conditional expectation conditioning on $\hat{x}^1, \hat{x}^2, \dots, \hat{x}^k$.

Following a similar argument to the proof of Proposition 4 when Assumption A5(b) holds, we define $\Delta_k = H(\hat{x}^k) - H(x^*) + \frac{L}{2}(\hat{x}^k - x^*)^2$ for $k \geq 1$. We then use induction to show $\mathbb{E}\Delta_k \leq \frac{\Delta_1 + \sigma^2/\mu}{2^{k-1}}$ for $k \geq 1$. Note that this statement holds trivially when $k = 1$. Suppose $\mathbb{E}\Delta_k \leq \frac{\Delta_1 + \sigma^2/\mu}{2^{k-1}}$. Now we consider $\mathbb{E}\Delta_{k+1}$.

By setting $\eta_t^k = \frac{1}{2^{k+1}\mu + L} \in (0, \frac{1}{L})$ and summing (20) over $t = 1, 2, \dots, T - 1$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\Delta_{k+1} = \mathbb{E}_k(H(\hat{x}^{k+1}) - H(x^*)) \leq \frac{(2^{k+1}\mu + L)(\hat{x}^k - x^*)^2}{2T_k} + \frac{\Delta_k}{T_k} + \frac{\sigma^2}{2^{k+1}\mu} \leq (2^{k+1} + 1) \frac{\Delta_k}{T_k} + \frac{\sigma^2}{2^{k+1}\mu},$$

Taking expectation over $\hat{x}^1, \hat{x}^2, \dots, \hat{x}^k$ and applying the induction assumption $\mathbb{E}\Delta_k = \frac{\Delta_1 + \sigma^2/\mu}{2^{k-1}}$, we can obtain (23). Thus, $\mathbb{E}\Delta_k \leq \frac{\Delta_1 + \sigma^2/\mu}{2^{k-1}}$ for $k \geq 1$. Since $T = \sum_{k=1}^K T_k = \sum_{k=1}^K (2^{k+3} + 4) \leq 2^{K+5}$, we have $K \geq \log_2(T/32)$. Let $k = K$ in (23), we have

$$\mathbb{E}(H(\hat{x}^{K+1}) - H(x^*)) = \mathbb{E}\Delta_{K+1} \leq \frac{\Delta_1 + \sigma^2/\mu}{2^K} = \frac{32(\Delta_1 + \sigma^2/\mu)}{T}.$$

Thus the proposition is proved. \square

Appendix C: CBA with Categorical Results from Comparison

In CBA given in Algorithm 1, the results of the comparison between x and ξ is binary, i.e., either $\xi > x$ or $\xi < x$. In this section, we extend CBA to allow the comparison result to be categorical and depend on the gap between ξ and x . In particular, we assume there exist $m+1$ non-negative quantities $\theta_0, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{m-1}$ and θ_m satisfying $0 =: \theta_0 < \theta_1 < \dots < \theta_{m-2} < \theta_{m-1} < \theta_m := +\infty$ such that, after presenting a solution x , we know whether $\xi \in (x + \theta_i, x + \theta_{i+1}]$ or $\xi \in [x - \theta_{i+1}, x - \theta_i)$ for all $i = 0, 1, \dots, m-1$. Using Example 1 as an example, this type of comparison result corresponds to the case where the customer reports a coarse level of the difference between his/her preferred value of the feature and the actual value of the feature of the product presented to him/her (e.g., whether the size of the product is too small, a little small, a little large or too large). Note that the binary comparison result is a special case of the categorical result with $m = 1$.

To facilitate the development of algorithm, we need to replace Assumption A2 with the following assumption:

(A2') For each ξ , $h(x, \xi)$ is continuously differentiable with respect to x on $[\ell, \xi]$ and $(\xi, u]$ with the derivative denoted by $h'_x(x, \xi)$. Furthermore, for any $x \in [\ell, u]$, $h'_-(x, x - \theta_i) := \lim_{z \rightarrow x - \theta_i} h'_x(x, z)$ and $h'_+(x, x + \theta_i) := \lim_{z \rightarrow x + \theta_i} h'_x(x, z)$ exist and are finite for any $i = 0, 1, \dots, m-1$.

With this comparative information, we propose a comparison-based algorithm with categorical comparison result (CBA-C) to solve (1). The algorithm requires specification of $2m$ functions, $f_-^i(x, z)$ and $f_+^i(x, z)$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, m-1$, which need to satisfy the following conditions.

- (C1') $f_-^i(x, z) = 0$ for all $z \notin [x - \theta_{i+1}, x - \theta_i)$ and $f_-^i(x, z) > 0$ for all $\max\{\underline{s}, x - \theta_{i+1}\} \leq z \leq x - \theta_i$. In addition, for all x , we have $\int_{x - \theta_{i+1}}^{x - \theta_i} f_-^i(x, z) dz = 1$.

- (C2') $f_+^i(x, z) = 0$ for all $z \notin (x + \theta_i, x + \theta_{i+1}]$ and $f_+^i(x, z) > 0$ for all $\min\{\bar{s}, x + \theta_{i+1}\} \geq z > x + \theta_i$. In addition, for all x , we have $\int_{x + \theta_i}^{x + \theta_{i+1}} f_+^i(x, z) dz = 1$.

- (C3') There exists a constant K_3^i such that $\int_{x - \theta_{i+1}}^{x - \theta_i} \frac{(F(z) - F(x - \theta_{i+1}))(h''_{x,z}(x, z))^2}{f_-^i(x, z)} dz \leq K_3$ and $\int_{x - \theta_{i+1}}^{x - \theta_i} \frac{(F(x + \theta_{i+1}) - F(z))(h''_{x,z}(x, z))^2}{f_+^i(x, z)} dz \leq K_3$ for all $x \in [\ell, u]$, where $F(\cdot)$ is the c.d.f. of ξ .

Note that $f_-^i(x, z)$ and $f_+^i(x, z)$ essentially define the density function on $[x - \theta_{i+1}, x - \theta_i)$ and $(x + \theta_i, x + \theta_{i+1}]$, respectively, for any given $x \in [\ell, u]$. The functions $f_-^i(x, z)$ and $f_+^i(x, z)$ satisfying C1'-C3' can be constructed in a similar way as in Example 5 and 6 and their optimal choices are similar to (8) and (9). Next, in Algorithm 5, we describe the detailed procedure of the CBA-C.

We have the following proposition about the comparison-based algorithm with categorical result.

PROPOSITION 9. Suppose $f_-^i(x, z)$ and $f_+^i(x, z)$ satisfy (C1')-(C3') and Assumption 1 holds with (A2) replaced by (A2'). Then

1. $\mathbb{E}_z g(x, \xi, z) = h'_x(x, \xi)$, for all $x \in [\ell, u]$, $x \neq \xi$.
2. $\mathbb{E}_{z, \xi} g(x, \xi, z) = H'(x)$, for all $x \in [\ell, u]$.
3. If Assumption A5(a) holds, then $\mathbb{E}_{z, \xi} (g(x, \xi, z))^2 \leq G'^2 := K_1^2 + 2 \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} K_3^i$. If Assumption A5(b) holds, then $\mathbb{E}_{z, \xi} (g(x, \xi, z) - H'(x))^2 \leq \sigma'^2 := K_2^2 + 2 \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} K_3^i$.

Algorithm 5 Comparison-Based Algorithm with Categorical Comparison Result (CBA-C):

1. **Initialization.** Set $t = 1$, $x_1 \in [\ell, u]$. Define η_t for all $t \geq 1$. Set the maximum number of iterations T . Choose functions $f_-^i(x, z)$ and $f_+^i(x, z)$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, m-1$ that satisfy (C1')-(C3').
2. **Main iteration.** Sample ξ_t from the distribution of ξ . If $\xi_t = x_t$, then resample ξ_t until it does not equal x_t . (This step will always terminate in a finite number of steps as long as ξ is not deterministic.)
 - (a) If $\xi_t \in [x_t - \theta_{i+1}, x_t - \theta_i]$, then generate z_t from a distribution on $[x_t - \theta_{i+1}, x_t - \theta_i]$ with p.d.f. $f_-^i(x_t, z_t)$. Set

$$g(x_t, \xi_t, z_t) = \begin{cases} h'_-(x_t, x_t - \theta_i), & \text{if } z_t < \xi_t, \\ h'_-(x_t, x_t - \theta_i) - \frac{h''_{x,z}(x_t, z_t)}{f_-(x_t, z_t)}, & \text{if } z_t \geq \xi_t. \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

- (b) If $\xi_t \in (x_t + \theta_i, x_t + \theta_{i+1}]$, then generate z_t from a distribution on $(x_t + \theta_i, x_t + \theta_{i+1}]$ with p.d.f. $f_+^i(x_t, z_t)$. Set

$$g(x_t, \xi_t, z_t) = \begin{cases} h'_+(x_t, x_t + \theta_i), & \text{if } z_t > \xi_t, \\ h'_+(x_t, x_t + \theta_i) + \frac{h''_{x,z}(x_t, z_t)}{f_+(x_t, z_t)}, & \text{if } z_t \leq \xi_t. \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

Let

$$x_{t+1} = \text{Proj}_{[\ell, u]}(x_t - \eta_t g(x_t, \xi_t, z_t)) = \max(\ell, \min(u, x_t - \eta_t g(x_t, \xi_t, z_t))). \quad (26)$$

3. **Termination.** Stop when $t \geq T$. Otherwise, let $t \leftarrow t + 1$ and go back to Step 2.
 4. **Output.** $\text{CBA-C}(x_1, T, \{\eta_t\}_{t=1}^T) = \bar{x}_T = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T x_t$.
-

Proof of Proposition 9. First, we consider the case when $\xi \in [x - \theta_{i+1}, x - \theta_i]$. We have

$$\mathbb{E}_z g(x, \xi, z) = h'_-(x, x - \theta_i) - \int_{\xi}^{x - \theta_i} h''_{x,z}(x, z) dz = h'_x(x, \xi).$$

Similarly, when $\xi \in (x + \theta_i, x + \theta_{i+1}]$,

$$\mathbb{E}_z g(x, \xi, z) = h'_+(x, x + \theta_i) + \int_{x + \theta_i}^{\xi} h''_{x,z}(x, z) dz = h'_x(x, \xi).$$

Thus the first conclusion of the proposition is proved. The second conclusion of the proposition follows from Assumption A1 (which ensures $\xi = x$ is a zero-measure event) and Assumption A4.

Next, we show the first part of the third conclusion when Assumption A5(a) is true. If $\xi \in [x - \theta_{i+1}, x - \theta_i]$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_z (g(x, \xi, z))^2 &= (h'_-(x, x - \theta_i))^2 + \int_{\xi}^{x - \theta_i} \left(-2h'_-(x - \theta_i) \frac{h''_{x,z}(x, z)}{f_-^i(x, z)} + \left(\frac{h''_{x,z}(x, z)}{f_-^i(x, z)} \right)^2 \right) f_-^i(x, z) dz \\ &= (h'_-(x, x - \theta_i))^2 - 2h'_-(x, x - \theta_i)(h'_-(x, x - \theta_i) - h'_x(x, \xi)) + \int_{\xi}^{x - \theta_i} \frac{(h''_{x,z}(x, z))^2}{f_-^i(x, z)} dz \\ &\leq (h'_x(x, \xi))^2 + \int_{\xi}^{x - \theta_i} \frac{(h''_{x,z}(x, z))^2}{f_-^i(x, z)} dz. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

where the last inequality is because $a^2 + b^2 \geq 2ab$ for any a, b . By similar arguments, if $\xi \in (x + \theta_i, x + \theta_{i+1}]$, then

$$\mathbb{E}_z(g(x, \xi, z))^2 \leq (h'_x(x, \xi))^2 + \int_{x+\theta_i}^{\xi} \frac{(h''_{x,z}(x, z))^2}{f_+^i(x, z)} dz.$$

These two inequalities and Assumption A5(a) further imply

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{z, \xi}(g(x, \xi, z))^2 \\ & \leq K_1^2 + \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \int_{x-\theta_{i+1}}^{x-\theta_i} \left(\int_{\xi}^{x-\theta_i} \frac{(h''_{x,z}(x, z))^2}{f_-^i(x, z)} dz \right) dF(\xi) + \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \int_{x+\theta_i}^{x+\theta_{i+1}} \left(\int_{x+\theta_i}^{\xi} \frac{(h''_{x,z}(x, z))^2}{f_+^i(x, z)} dz \right) dF(\xi) \\ & = K_1^2 + \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \int_{x-\theta_{i+1}}^{x-\theta_i} \frac{(F(z) - F(x - \theta_{i+1}))(h''_{x,z}(x, z))^2}{f_-^i(x, z)} dz + \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \int_{x+\theta_i}^{x+\theta_{i+1}} \frac{(F(x + \theta_{i+1}) - F(z))(h''_{x,z}(x, z))^2}{f_+^i(x, z)} dz \\ & \leq K_1^2 + 2 \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} K_3^i, \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

where the interchanging of integrals in the equality is justified by Tonelli's theorem and the last inequality is due to (C3').

Next, we show the second part of the third conclusion when Assumption A5(b) is true. If $\xi \in [x - \theta_{i+1}, x - \theta_i)$, then following the similar analysis as in (27), we have

$$\mathbb{E}_z(g(x, \xi, z) - h'_x(x, \xi))^2 = \mathbb{E}_z(g(x, \xi, z))^2 - (h'_x(x, \xi))^2 \leq \int_{\xi}^{x-\theta_i} \frac{(h''_{x,z}(x, z))^2}{f_-^i(x, z)} dz.$$

Similarly, if $\xi \in (x + \theta_i, x + \theta_{i+1}]$, then

$$\mathbb{E}_z(g(x, \xi, z) - h'_x(x, \xi))^2 \leq \int_{x+\theta_i}^{\xi} \frac{(h''_{x,z}(x, z))^2}{f_+^i(x, z)} dz.$$

By using the same argument as in (28), we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{z, \xi}(g(x, \xi, z) - h'_x(x, \xi))^2 \leq 2 \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} K_3^i.$$

Finally, we note that,

$$\mathbb{E}_{z, \xi}(g(x, \xi, z) - H'(x))^2 = \mathbb{E}_{z, \xi}(g(x, \xi, z) - h'_x(x, \xi))^2 + \mathbb{E}_{\xi}(h'_x(x, \xi) - H'(x))^2.$$

Therefore, when Assumption A5(b) holds, we have $\mathbb{E}_{z, \xi}(g(x, \xi, z) - H'(x))^2 \leq K_2^2 + 2 \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} K_3^i$.

Thus the proposition holds. \square

Proposition 9 shows that in the CBA-C, the gradient estimate $g(x, \xi, z)$ is an unbiased estimate of the true gradient at x and can be utilized as a stochastic gradient of $H(x)$. As a result, we can also prove that the convergence rates for CBA-C is exactly the same as those of CBA given in Proposition 2 and 3 except that G^2 and σ^2 are replaced by G'^2 and σ'^2 .

We also conduct some numerical experiments using CBA-C and the results are given in Appendix D.2.

Appendix D: Additional Numerical Tests

D.1. Additional Numerical Results for Mini-Batch Methods

In this section, we present more numerical results on the performance of CBA depends on the sample size S in the mini-batch technique described in Section 4.3. The results here are supplementary to the results presented in Section 5.3.

With the same instances and setting as in Section 5.3, we present the convergence of CBA with $S = 1, 2, 5, 10, 100$ in Figure 6. Different from Figure 4, the horizontal axis in Figure 6 represents the CPU time elapsed. According to the figures, additional comparisons with z do not always improve the time efficiency of CBA. In fact, the CBAs with a small batch size ($S = 1$ or 2) converges faster as time increases in the first column of Figure 4 while the CBAs with a medium batch size ($S = 5$ or 10) converges faster in the second column. This does not contradict with the results in Figure 4 because, within the same amount of time, the CBAs with a small S can run more iterations than the CBAs with a large S . Hence, the CBA with the largest batch size (i.e. $S = 100$) converges most slowly due to its long runtime per iteration. In practice, one can experiment with difference values of S to achieve the best time efficiency in CBA.

After studying the impact of mini-batch method to CBA, we also show how mini-batch affects SGD and whether the performance of CBA relative to SGD we found in Figure 1 still holds when using different batch sizes. Therefore, we also implement SGD by generating S samples of ξ and using the average of the gradients of h at each sample to perform the stochastic gradient descent step. We also present the convergence of both and CBA and SGD in Figure 7 with $S = 1, 2, 5, 10, 100$ in order to compare their performances with different batch sizes. These figures reveal the similar phenomenon as we found in Section 5.1 that CBA converges more slowly than SGD with the same batch size because CBA uses less information. However, CBA does not require knowing ξ exactly so that it can be applied in some scenarios where SGD cannot be implemented.

D.2. Categorical Results from Comparison

We conduct numerical experiments to test the performance of the CBA-C (Algorithm 5) through a comparison with SGD and CBA. We consider the same two objective functions h_1 and h_2 and the same two distributions of ξ as in Section 5.1. The implementation of SGD and CBA, including the choice of η_t , f_+ and f_- , is also the same as in Section 5.1. The number of the categorical results of the comparisons used in CBA-C is chosen to be $m = 3$ or $m = 5$. To implement CBA-C, we need to specify $2m$ distributions f_+^i and f_-^i for $i = 0, 1, \dots, m - 1$. When $\theta_{i+1} < +\infty$ so that $[x_t - \theta_{i+1}, x_t - \theta_i]$ and $(x_t + \theta_i, x_t + \theta_{i+1}]$ are bounded intervals, we choose f_-^i and f_+^i to be uniform distributions on the corresponding intervals. For the cases where $\theta_{i+1} = +\infty$ (i.e., $i = m - 1$) so




Figure 6 The convergence of the average relative optimality gap in CBA when using different numbers of comparisons (S) in the mini-batch method. First row: $h_1(x, \xi)$; Second row: $h_2(x, \xi)$. First column: $\xi \sim \mathcal{U}[50, 150]$; Second column: $\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(100, 100)$.

that $[x_t - \theta_{i+1}, x_t - \theta_i]$ and $(x_t + \theta_i, x_t + \theta_{i+1}]$ are unbounded in one end, we choose f_-^i and f_+^i to be exponential distributions as in Example 6 with $\lambda_+ = \lambda_- = 2^{-4} = 0.0625$. For the same reasons given in Examples 5 and 6, the distribution function f_+^i and f_-^i chosen in this way satisfy (C1')-(C3').

Similar to Section 5.1, in all tests, we start from a random initial point $x_1 \sim \mathcal{U}[50, 150]$ and run each algorithm for $T = 500$ iterations and we report the average relative optimality gap $\delta_t = \frac{H(\bar{x}_t) - H(x^*)}{H(x^*)}$ over 2000 independent trails for each t . The results are reported in Figure 8. The bar at each point represents the standard error of the corresponding δ_t .

Algorithm	$h_1(x, \xi)$		$h_2(x, \xi)$	
	$\xi \sim \mathcal{U}[50, 150]$	$\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(100, 100)$	$\xi \sim \mathcal{U}[50, 150]$	$\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(100, 100)$
SGD	0.008	0.007	0.010	0.040
CBA	0.011	0.018	0.013	0.049
CBA-C($m = 3$)	0.012	0.023	0.023	0.065
CBA-C($m = 5$)	0.012	0.026	0.025	0.064

Table 4 The computation time (in seconds) of different algorithms for 500 iterations for the four instances.




Figure 7 The convergence of the average relative optimality gap in CBA (solid lines) and SGD (dot lines) when using different batch sizes (S) per iteration. **First row:** $h_1(x, \xi)$; **Second row:** $h_2(x, \xi)$. **First column:** $\xi \sim \mathcal{U}[50, 150]$; **Second column:** $\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(100, 100)$.

From the results shown in Figure 8, we can see that CBA-C converges faster than CBA in these problems. Moreover, the convergence speed of CBA-C is higher for a larger m . This is because the comparison results in CBA-C are categorical instead of binary so that they provide more information about the gap between x and ξ which helps to construct a more precision stochastic gradient than CBA. This information becomes more precise as m increases. Also, as shown in Table 4, the computation time of CBA-C for 500 iterations is less than 0.1 seconds and is similar to CBA.




Figure 8 The convergence of the average relative optimality gap for different algorithms for the four instances. First row: $h_1(x, \xi)$; Second row: $h_2(x, \xi)$. First column: $\xi \sim \mathcal{U}[50, 150]$; Second column: $\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(100, 100)$.